DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 677 UD 020 115

AUTHOR Wax, Murray L., Ed.
TITLE Desegregated Schools: An Intimate Portrait Based on Five Ethnographic Studies.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Educational Policy and Organization Group.
PUB DATE Aug 79
GRANT NIE-G-78-0046
NOTE 139p.; Prepared by the Desegregation Studies Team

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Students; Caucasian Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnography; *Integration Effects; Integration Methods; *Integration Studies; Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; *Racially Balanced Schools; *School Integration; *School Resegregation; Teacher Integration

ABSTRACT

This is a summary and synthesis of five ethnographic studies of desegregated schools over a period of about two years. It seeks to determine whether the desegregation process in the public schools has resulted in integration. (Desegregation and integration are seen as distinct phenomena, with integration defined as the attaining of, and respect for, cultural diversity in the educational setting.) To determine to what extent integration has taken place, the report analyzes five schools in communities with different economic, social, and geographic characteristics. It is reported that in these schools, desegregation occurred, but not integration; as white students declined in numbers, resegregation emerged. The relationship of the schools to their districts and community, the role of principals, and attitudes on race and education are also discussed. Student behavior, attitudes, and activities are analyzed to determine their relationship to racial cooperation and respect for different life styles. Also included are three critical essays that interpret the main body of the report and apply it to other specific situations, and several bibiliographies. (WP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179677

JAN 4 - 1980

UD

DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS:
AN INTIMATE PORTRAIT BASED ON
FIVE ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDIES

MURRAY L. WAX

Principal Editor

August 1979

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary
Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education

National Institute of Education
Patricia Albjerg Graham, Director

Educational Policy and Organization
Marc S. Tucker, Associate Director

Desegregation Studies Team
Ronald D. Henderson, Team Leader

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD020115

The work reported herein was performed pursuant to Grant No. NIE G 78 0046. The project was supervised by the Principal Investigator, Murray L. Wax. The opinions expressed herein are those of the various authors and investigators and are not to be attributed to NIE.

CONTENTS

Part I. An Intimate Portrait Based on Five Ethnographic Studies

Preface

I. Introduction, 1
  The Problem
  Is Desegregation Integration?
  Integration: Assimilation Versus Cultural Pluralism

II. Methodology, 6

  Ethnography: An Explanation, 6
    Ethnography and observation

  Sources of Data, 7
    Observation
    Interviews
    Other sources of data

  Data Quality Control, 9
    Observer bias: selective effects
    Observer bias: reactive effects
    Limitations of the studies

  A Note on Confidentiality, 12

  Summary, 13

III. Research Sites, 14
  Memphis: Crossover High School
  Bradford: Grandin Elementary School
  Waterford: Wexler Middle School
  New York City: Sheridan High School
  Pawnee: Pawnee West High School

  Summary, 31

IV. Administration and Teachers, 32
  The Relationship of the School to the District and the Community, 32
    School board demands
    Budget demands
    Community demands
    Union demands

  Coping Mechanisms: The Role of the Principal, 34
    Bureaucratic tools
    Principal style

  Assumptions about Desegregation and Educational Attitudes, 36
    The colorblind perspective
    Importance attached to desegregation
      Efforts to provide opportunities for interracial

interaction and understanding
Differences in style between black and white teachers
Academics first and tracking
Importance of security and order to control violence

Perceived quality of education since desegregation, 45

Summary , 46

V. Students , 48

Sources of Status , 48
Extracurricular activities
Social class and extracurricular activities
Academics
Perceived effects of tracking

Relations with Teachers and Administrators , 57
Negotiations for time in classroom
Skipping
Cultural differences between students and teachers
Interracial Relations
Turfs
Differences in levels of aggression between blacks and whites
Other cultural differences
Police cooperation and avoidance
Ethnic labeling
The development of friendship: The effects of self-sorting and stigma

Summary , 68

VI. Interpretive Comments , 72
The value of ethnographic studies of schools

Reference Notes , 75

References Cited , 77

Part II. Critical Remarks on the Portrait

I. Desegregation, Integration, and Interaction Theory: An Appraisal -- John U. Ogbu , 84

II. Observations of a Middle School Teacher -- Rachel Melechen , 104

III. Less Than Meets the Eye -- Margaret D. LeCompte , 118

PREFACE

In 1975, the National Institute of Education contracted with a number of research teams to conduct ethnographic studies of desegregated schools over a period of about two years. During 1978, the following five final reports were submitted:

The Emerging Order: An Ethnography of a Southern Desegregated School, by Dorothy C. Clement, Margaret Eisenhart, Joe R. Harding, with Michael Livesay (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina)

Stratification and Resegregation: The Case of Crossover High School Memphis, Tennessee, by Thomas W. Collins and George W. Noblit (Memphis, TE: Memphis State University)

A Field Study of Culture Contact and Desegregation in an Urban High Schooly, by Francis A. J. Ianni, Mercer Lee Sullivan, Margaret Orr, Samuel Henry, and John Mavros (New York, NY: Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University)

Hard Walls-Soft Walls: The Social Ecology of an Urban Desegregated High School, by Jacqueline Scherer (Rochester, MI: Oakland University) and Edward J. Slawski, Jr.

Social Process and Peer Relations in a "Nearly Integrated" Middle School, by Janet Ward Schofield with H. Andrew Sagar (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh).

In addition to these final reports there was an interim report from the team headed by Julie Stulac, which had been organizationally located in the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

In length, the final reports varied from about 50,000 to 130,000 words and, given the density of their ethnograpic observations, they varied considerably in their appeal to the reading public.

The present work constitutes an attempt to summarize and integrate the major findings of those five final reports into a compass of about 30,000 words. The work was commissioned with the hope that the process of textual integration would serve to bring forward the common findings among the five investigations, while the shortened size would mean a wider audience than might be gained by any single report. Moreover, it was also hoped that the textual integration would lead to a de-emphasis of the faults and virtues of the particular sites while focusing attention on the common problems entailed in desegregating the schools.

The basic text was produced by Alice Greenwald, who worked closely with the five final reports, so that much that follows consists of excerptings. Her work was supervised by Murray L. Wax (the Principal Investigator for the project); he went over the manuscript and added some additional materials and interpretations and the final chapter of conclusions. Program Officer for the project has been Ronald Henderson, Head, Desegregation Studies Section, National Institute of Education. Typing and management of clerical details were performed or supervised by Sophia Goodman. The resulting text is such a compound product that it is hard to assign credit or responsibility to any single individual or research team.

PART I

AN INTIMATE PORTRAIT BASED ON FIVE ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDIES

I. INTRODUCTION

By invalidating the old patterns of school segregation, the Federal Government brought together ingredients for a new social order in the schools. It did not, however, specify the social patterns that were to arise in the newly desegregated schools. Nor did it specify the extent to which blacks and whites would participate in the same groups and activities, be assured equal treatment inside the desegregated schools, or learn from one another about the nature of social differences and their interactional consequences. Thus, the locally elected school boards, and their administrators and educators, were faced with the task of fleshing out the new patterns. Beginning with Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and continuing through a variety of subsequent legislation, the Federal Government attempted to provide financial and other assistance to school districts, but this could not eliminate a problem which had a long and painful history and which now had to be faced and resolved in local classrooms, hallways, and playgrounds, amidst the bitter struggles of community factions and pressure groups.[1]

The difficulty of the task of creating a new order should not be underestimated. Our society provides little in the way of positive models of social-race relations. Instead, the pathway to new relations is clogged by the legacies of negative race terminology, racism as a framework for interpreting black-white interaction, and the country's history of slavery and oppression. At the same time, there are educational requirements to be met. The principals, teachers, staff, students, and parents in the schools discussed in this report have taken many positive steps in avoiding violence, extreme mistrust, and the degree of academic alienation sometimes reported for desegregated schools.

The Problem

There has been an extraordinary amount of research on school desegregation in recent years. The ERIC index alone lists over 2500 studies on this topic written within the last decade. However, as shown by St. John's (1975) review of literature, this research is far from conclusive about the effects of desegregation on either children's academic achievement or their social development. St. John strongly suggests that a major reason for the inconclusiveness of the research is that researchers have tended to ignore the strong possibility that racial mixing per se is far less important than the specific conditions under which interracial contact occurs. Allport (1954) and Pettigrew (1967) have both argued, as does St. John, that the nature of the contact situation vitally influences the effect that desegregation will have on individuals. Yet, to a remarkable extent, research has focused on measuring the outcomes of desegregation without closely examining what are the actual experiences of attending desegregated schools.

The inconclusiveness of the research literature gives little encouragement to those who perceive school desegregation as an instant panacea able to raise black students' academic achievement and to improve intergroup relations and attitudes. But consideration of the work of social scientists like Allport, Pettigrew, and St. John suggests

that there was little reason to have expected that the mere mixing of black and white students, regardless of the circumstances, would quickly have a wide range of desirable effects.

The present report discusses the findings of two-year case studies of five desegregated urban schools. As ethnographic studies of desegregated schools, the researchers were focused upon the behavioral and symbolic correlates of "race"--in other words, the place of social race in the social order of schools. The primary objective of the investigators has been to describe and analyze the schools as contexts for black-white (or multi-ethnic) participation, understanding, and socialization. In addition, the researchers have studied factors, including the dynamics of the community, district-level pressures, school organization, etc., in shaping the social order found in the schools.

There are several reasons why these studies orient their inquiries around the development of interracial interaction. First, previous research suggests that the development of positive social relationships between black and white students may help to account for the academic gains of black students in some interracial schools (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967).[2] Katz's (1964) work clearly suggests both that positive intergroup relations may facilitate black achievement in a desegregated setting while negative relations may undermine it. One might expect the same to be true for whites, especially in a school with a substantial black population. Second, research makes it clear that attitude change often follows rather than precedes behavior change (Bem 1972; Festinger 1957; Schofield 1972). Thus, if students can be induced to begin to act neutrally or positively toward each other, they may experience some consequent positive change in their attitudes. Third, Jencks et al. (1972), as well as others, have suggested that more attention should be paid to structuring schools so that they are reasonably pleasurable environments for students. This viewpoint emphasizes that, in addition to being agencies that prepare students for future roles, schools are also the environments in which many people spend nearly half of their waking hours for a significant proportion of their lives. This line of argument suggests that even if positive or negative interracial experiences do not cause generalized change in interracial behaviors and attitudes outside the school situation, positive interracial relationships within the school setting may be of some value.

Is Desegregation Integration?

Any study that deals with black-white relations in public schools must come to grips with the issue of desegregation. However, any attempt to do just that confronts the scholar with a bewildering complexity. As one author noted:

> ...the national discourse on school integration exists on many levels and with many sets of untested and unexplicated assumptions. School integration has multiple realities...No single value system or perspective can be so catholic as to encompass all the divergencies inherent in the phenomenon (Rist 1976:417).

Cohen (1975) and St. John (1975) both argue convincingly that the lack of theoretical perspective in desegregation research is a major contributing factor to the inconclusiveness of the literature taken as a whole. Typically, researchers have studied a particular example of desegregation and looked for changes in students' attitudes or behaviors that could be attributed to their interracial experience. However, because they bring no theoretical framework that would suggest what characteristics of the desegregated setting might relate to those changes, researchers pay little attention to what the desegregated setting is actually like. Because interracial schools differ so dramatically on so many variables, contradictory outcomes are found. Without a theoretical perspective, one has little idea of what patterns to look for and confusion abounds.

The only really widely shared theoretical perspective on desegregation and intergroup relations is that suggested by Allport's (1954) contact theory. Allport's basic thesis is relatively straightforward. He argues that intergroup contact may reinforce previously held stereotypes and increase intergroup hostility unless the contact situation is structured in a way that provides equal status for minority and majority group members and provides strong institutional support for positive relations. Allport also stresses the necessity of cooperative interaction aimed toward the achievement of shared goals. Unless these conditions are met, he asserts that improvement in intergroup relations is unlikely.

Pettigrew (1967) has argued that it is a mistake to use one word, "desegregation," to apply to all types of interracial schooling. He has drawn a distinction between what he calls merely desegregated schools and genuinely integrated schools.

Desegregation is considered to be a deliberate effort to promote new patterns of interaction between groups historically separated by the stigmatization of one group on the basis of characteristics such as skin color. Integration may be defined as a possible outcome of desegregation whereby spontaneous cooperation and acceptance between groups is achieved (Pettigrew 1969; Weinberg 1970). Pettigrew et al. (1973:92-93) write "Desegregation is achieved by simply ending segregation and bringing blacks and whites together; it implies nothing about the quality of interracial interaction." Integration, on the other hand, is achieved only when Allport's conditions for fostering positive intergroup contact have been met. Pettigrew (1973) argues, for example, that Allport's equal status criterion requires that the integrated schools provide equal access to sources of social status as well as to physical facilities and materials. Hence, he contends that an integrated school's staff must be interracial at all levels and that positions that give students formal or informal status, such as student council membership, must not be monopolized by either group. Pettigrew also sees strict ability grouping on the basis of test scores as incompatible with the equal status criterion when it leads to heavily resegregated classrooms with differential status. Pettigrew (1967) also argues that in addition to equal status contact and cooperation to meet shared goals, true integration also requires support from the concerned authorities for positive intergroup relations. Unless a concerted effort is made to foster equal status, cooperation, and intergroup relations, there is

little hope that true integration can be achieved.

Integration: Assimilation Versus Cultural Pluralism

But what do we mean when we talk about integration? Do equal status, cooperation toward shared goals, and positive support for intergroup relations mean that the minority group must adapt to the ways of the majority? Does integration mean assimilation? The answer to this question has changed many times within our generation.

Stage One:

Q: Why are blacks not more like us?

A: They don't have any culture, they are culturally deprived.

Stage Two:

Q: Why are blacks performing less well in school than whites?

A: Language is the mediator of the intellect. Blacks use a "restricted language code" that prevents them from performing sophisticated intellectual functions. They are culturally disadvantaged.

Stage Three:

Q: Well, blacks do speak English and can learn "elaborated" codes of language. Why do they still perform less well than whites in school?

A: The culture of the blacks is not congruent with the culture of the schools. They are culturally different.

Stage Four:

Q: Some blacks seem to do just fine in school and in the working world. Why?

A: They are bicultural.

It has been argued that the attitudes held in Stages One through Three are based historically on an assimilative logic that has led to increased bureaucratization of the schools. Katz (1975) has theorized that the origins of public education in the United States were part of a movement to maintain Protestantism over Catholicism as the dominant form of religion in the country. Because more and more immigrants had to be integrated into the industrial order, the logic of assimilation prevailed throughout the 19th century. In fact, it has been argued that the persistent logic of the public school movement has emphasized assimilation over intellectual development (Karier, Violas, and Spring 1973).[3]

In this historical context it can be seen that as the ways of defining black culture in relation to white culture vary, so do the possible definitions of integration. In his analysis of integrated education, Rist (1975) argues that integration can mean the assimilation of a class or racial minority into the culture of the majority (because they are culturally deprived, disadvantaged, or different) or integra-

tion can mean a respect for racial or class pluralism. If we accept Pettigrew's criteria for integration of equal status, cooperation toward shared goals, and positive support, we must accept Rist's second definition of integration, that is, respect for racial or ethnic pluralism.

It should be emphasized that integration and desegregation can be, and we assume usually are in the case of public education today, mutually exclusive. Our definition of integration requires, if one believes Katz (1975), a reorganization of education to achieve a respect for, and a basis in, cultural diversity, while desegregation requires no change in the current logic of public education--only how students and teachers are physically arranged by race.

As the Federal Government moved to adopt a social policy with regard to the desegregation of public schools, it created a new market for social science research (Cohen & Weiss 1976; Crain 1976). Some policy-makers and administrators may have hoped that social research would provide a "quick fix," and so a variety of empirical studies were commissioned, mostly to be conducted via survey and experimental methods.

The wholesale reliance on these methods has been unfortunate, for these have stringent conditions on their efficient utilization. The researcher needs a well-developed system of concepts and theory in which to ground the inquiry. In the context of applied research, designed to be relevant to questions of policy, the system of concepts and theory must be constructed; it cannot simply be imported from the existing materials of social science. Thus there must be a process of development of relevant methods and theory.

Moreover, survey methods are most productive when they are used to test a well-grounded hypothesis concerning casual relationships, or when they attempt to generalize the results of smaller or exploratory investigations to large populations. In the absence of an understanding of the context as provided by thorough familiarity through experience and/or ethnographic research, and without at least some theoretical orientation, these methods are often misapplied.

Among their other uses, ethnographic methods are particularly suited to describing new situations; discovering unsuspected processual sequences that develop over a period of weeks, months, or years; or providing insights as to previously unanticipated casual factors. Experimental and survey methods are not as efficient for these purposes. For a research topic such as school desegregation, which does involve a new situation and which is neither illuminated by theory nor described ethnographically, it is quite possible that surveys and experiments (although impeccably designed for statistical and inferential purposes) provide data of little conceptual significance. To ask meaningful questions, the researcher must have at least minimum background information on the setting. The dissemination of the findings from this present set of ethnographic studies provide an occasion for educational statesmen to review what actually is occurring within desegregated schools, rethink policies, and, where appropriate, commission research that builds constructively on what is now being discovered. Failure to take account of the methodological and substantive findings of these studies will have the consequence that the public schools will continue to be a focus of social conflict, at grave cost to the education of children.

II. METHODOLOGY

Ethnography: An Explanation

For those unfamiliar with ethnographic fieldwork or uncertain about its methodological virtues and limitations, the remainder of this chapter is devoted to brief overviews of some of the critical methodological issues. A detailed and helpful description of the procedures employed by the research teams can be found in the fieldwork manual of Cassell (1978). Those seeking elaborations of these methodological discussions might consult such textbooks as those by Bruyn (1966), Denzin (1970), Glaser & Strauss (1967), Schatzman & Strauss (1973) or R.H. Wax (1971). There are also the readers edited by Denzin (1978), Kimball & Watson (1972), McCall & Simmons (1969), Spindler (1970), and Freilich (1970).

An ethnograhic study is distinctive from survey or experimental research in that it is an in-depth investigation of one case over a period of months or years. Guided by the purpose of the ethnography, the researcher sets out to document and analyze the natural stream of events and the interpretations and descriptions of those events as viewed by the participants. Exposure to the actual time ordering of events and to the symbolic and behavioral context of the events provides a holistic view (Redfield 1955) that is sacrificed in survey or experimental research, where the investigation must be limited to a small number of variables investigated over a short time span.[4] The ethnographer, on the other hand, in order to describe and analyze one case in depth, sacrifices a coverage of numerous cases and the control over variables that is held by the experimenter.

Ethnography and Observation

Observational strategies are commonly used in the study of educational settings. Unfortunately, it is the usual case that only "simple" observation is employed. "Simple" observation is defined as that type of observation that is not treated as a formal research technique or that which is restricted to only "counting" behaviors. Of course, all researchers use observational data, even if these are only used as the basis on which final research design is formulated. Further, these are often used to establish a basic description of the setting being studied (often reported in the "methods" section of quantitative studies or as "contextual" data reported elsewhere in the research report). Nevertheless, simple observation is used in a piecemeal fashion and limited in its end. Even when it is used to establish the teaching patterns or motion patterns of the participants via "counting," the limitations placed upon observation by the principal investigator are evident. Even among those who rely on qualitative, observational data, there are some who use the research procedure as an approximation of quantitative, positivistic approaches. These researchers justify such investigations by regarding them as exploratory and only hypothesis generating.

For the ethnographers whose researches are here summarized, the purpose was not simple observation of behavior, but "understanding" the meanings of that behavior. Rosalie Wax (1971: 10-11) describes what we mean by "understanding."

> Understanding ... does not refer to a mysterious empathy between human beings. Nor does it refer to an intuitive or rationalistic ascription of motivations. Instead, it is a social phenomenon--a phenomenon of shared meanings. (emphasis in the original)

Our attempt to get at these "shared meanings" is similar to what Clifford Geertz (1973:5-10) calls "thick description" in which, using field notes as the investigators' own constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to, they sort out "the structures of significance" in the patterns they observe. It is the responsibility of the investigators to make sense of the social action that they painstakingly record. This process is essentially "open-ended" and succeeds "to the degree [they are] able to clarify what goes on...to reduce puzzlement."

Because the orientations of the actors and the meanings of their actions are elucidated in good ethnography, it becomes of more relevance to policy-makers than more formal varieties of social research. Likewise, the very concreteness and wholism that serve to limit the universality of ethnographic findings prove of assistance to those who must frame alternatives suited to particular conditions. Fieldwork provides a portrait of a whole situation, including its distinctive groups and conflicts, and this is often more useful than research upon psychological traits or other individuated phenomena.

In ethnographic studies the emphasis is on allowing the design of the research to remain somewhat flexible and subject to change throughout the work. The ethnographic approach sees the substance of the field as emerging rather than fixed and finite. Field researchers tend to be methodological pragmatists, seeing each method's capabilities and limitations and through on-site experience learning which method best obtains adequate answers to posed questions. It is this approach that gives the impression of a lack of rigor in field research. In most research, rigor is equated with fixed adherence to a rigid and preplanned set of methods. But methods are, after all, merely instruments designed to identify and analyze the obdurate character of the empirical world and as such their value exists only in their ability to facilitate this task. Allowing skepticism or even new data to dictate changes in fixed procedures can be a very rigorous procedure, since it is done in an attempt to be absolutely faithful to the fixed reality.

Sources of Data

It should be clear from the above discussion that ethnography lends itself to the use of a wide variety of data gathering techniques. The primary method in all ethnographic research is "participant observation." The objective of this method is to observe and record the actions and interpretations of people involved in their usual activities. The extensive notes that are maintained on these general observations and informal interviews, along with available documents and data collected from standardized interviews and observations, constitute the body of data that is analyzed to produce the ethnography.

Observation. In all five studies discussed in this report, the researchers were careful to plan their observations so they would yield a fairly comprehensive picture of the experiences in each of their schools. In general, there was a theoretical sampling (Glaser & Strauss

1967) or oversampling of events that provided an opportunity or a set of conditions under which a facet of the social meaning of race, the informal groupings, and the social identities of the students could emerge.

These observations, both formal and informal, were generally made in classrooms; extracurricular activities such as school clubs; and special school events such as field trips, dances, etc. In some of the studies, focal students were chosen. These students were studied intensively as individuals, but were selected to be somewhat representative of a wide range of students. One method of focal student observation used extensively by one group of investigators was that of network analysis.

Network analysis. In 1954, J. A. Barnes wrote a paper that used the notion of "network" to help elucidate his study of class, kinship, and friendship in the Norwegian community of Bremnes. Barnes described his vision of a network as follows:

> Each person is, as it were, in touch with a number of other people, some of whom are directly in touch with each other and some of whom are not...I find it convenient to talk of a social field of this kind as a network. The image is of a net of points some of which are joined by lines...The points of the images are people, or sometimes groups, and the lines indicated which people interact with one another.

This notion of "network" soon became quite popular among anthropologists, who have increasingly incorporated network analysis to their research designs. "Network" has been popular because anthropologists have discovered that "group," "association," and "community,"--anthropological terms which have traditionally been used to describe relationships among numbers of people--have failed to yield adequate insight into the phenomena that these anthropologists were trying to understand.

Barnes has described a variety of general uses for network analysis:

> The notion of network has been developed in social anthropology to analyze and describe those social processes involving links across, rather than within, group and category limits. The interpersonal links that arise out of common group membership are as much a part the total social network as are those that link persons in different groups, and an analysis of action in terms of a network should reveal, among other things, the boundaries and internal structure of groups. While there are other ways of discovering groups, the network concept is indispensable in discussing those situations where, for example, the individual is involved in "interpersonal relations which cut right across the boundaries of village, subcaste and lineage" (Srinivas & Beteille 1964: 166). It is appropriate when enduring groups such as parties and factions have not formed, and where individuals are continually required to make choices about whom they should look to for leadership, help, information, and guidance. It helps to identify who are leaders and who are followers or to demonstrate that there is no enduring pattern of leadership (Barnes 1968).

Moreover, according to Barnes, network analysis is "concerned with choice in social action," with "the problems of why in a specified context a man chooses one course of action rather than another, why and when and how he selects one contact out of many possible and appeals to one principle rather than to others" (Barnes 1968).

Interviews. Observers, no matter how omnipresent or insightful, are at a great disadvantage if they not test their emerging ideas through direct inquiry with their subjects. A visitor from a greatly different culture might, after listening to conversations in public places like offices or shops, conclude that Americans are obsessed with the weather. Rain or shine, hot or cold, the weather is always commented upon. The acute observer might note that comments about the weather often follow awkward silences and begin to wonder about the social functions of such conversation. However, direct inquiry about why the weather is such a favorite topic of conversation would undoubtedly provide an observer with useful hypotheses that could then be assessed with more thought and further observation.

Whether formal or informal, interviews can be so useful in providing the observers with the participants' perspective that they were used extensively with teachers, students, and parents in these studies. In general, the interviews were structured to insure that specific topics were covered. However, the questions were open-ended to maximize the respondent's freedom to discuss the question precisely as he or she sees it.

Sociometric data. One special type of interview used by several of the investigators was the sociometric interview. Students were asked questions such as "Who are the children you would most like to work with? to play with?" Students in one study were also asked to rank their classmates on a five-point continuum.

Other sources of data. Another source of data used by all of the investigators was archival data. These include such things as school records, student newspapers, bulletins, and yearbooks, classroom rosters, minutes of PTA meetings, test results and norms, etc. One investigator even made note of bathroom graffiti.

Other techniques, such as videotaping and photographing classrooms, were also used by some of the investigators.

Data Quality Control

Observer bias: selective effects. Bias can come from any number of sources. The following is a discussion of a few of these sources of potential bias and some of the strategies used by these research teams to handle them. However, this is by no means a complete compilation of all the steps taken to minimize the impact of observer bias on data gathering and interpretation.

The observer in most classrooms cannot possibly hope to record literally everything that happens. Conceptual schemes and the research problem serve to focus awareness. However, a major source of bias may be the observer's selective recording of certain types of events. Although this problem seems next to impossible to surmount in qualitative observation, some techniques can minimize its negative effect. One obvious solution that was used in these studies was to have two researchers observe a setting both simultaneously and separately.

Thorough discussion of differences between the two observers' findings can help to point out individual biases or preconceptions. Another way to reduce the effect of biases is to consciously look for data that undercut one's developing assessment of a situation.

Unwarranted inferences made by the observer can also be a source of bias. To deal with this problem observers are trained to make the field notes as factual and as concretely descriptive as possible.

Selective recall also poses a significant problem when observations cannot be recorded as they are made. To minimize these problems, extensive hand-written notes were taken whenever it appeared that the gain in detail and completeness would outweigh losses from decreased frankness and spontaneity.

Even if the research team is able to set up procedures to minimize bias due to factors such as their own selective attention or selective recall, there are other factors that can lead to biased data if they are not recognized and handled appropriately. For example, care must be taken in deciding which teachers to approach with requests for permission to observe their classrooms.

Overall, the best way to counteract tendencies toward bias is to orient the observers toward an honest and faithful devotion to the research investigation. Bias is the negative of good and true research. All research develops from a distinct subcultural matrix. Bias is not to be feared but to be recognized, and good research is the art of transcending the limitations of one's initial perceptions and beliefs. (This is dramatically illustrated several times in the course of Rosalie H. Wax's narratives of research in the Japanese-American Relocation Centers and on Thrashing Buffalo Reservation.)

Observer bias: reactive effects. A participant observer, as the label implies, is a person who is involved as an actor in the ongoing stream of activities at the same time he or she is aware of the behavior of the other participants from the perspective of the research investigator. This dualistic stance demands an emotional detachment that becomes more difficult to maintain as personal involvement with the participants increases. The role of the researcher as participant may span the gamut from a concealed observer (a role now largely discredited on ethical grounds) to an observer who takes no part in the ongoing activities. In general, the researchers did not participate as more than observers, although one team of investigators included a student observer/informer.

The primary value of the ethnographic approach is that it provides data on the natural flow of events, on behavior in context. For this reason, the relationship of the researcher to the participants in the society or institution is important. The relationship affects the type of data that can be collected in the situation. The altering of behavior and concealment that occurs in response to an observer's presence must be taken in account and assessed. A participant observer who is not trusted or who is somehow inappropriate may very well see only that side of life that is exposed to distrusted strangers. Fortunately, it is generally possible to demonstrate that one deserves more trust; nonetheless, it must always be assumed that just as for other participants in the situation, some aspects of the situation are hidden to the observer and thus, to some extent, the study is always limited.

The most important initial feature of the investigators' activities to the teachers was the fact that they were observing in the teachers' classrooms. Teachers, especially in traditional classrooms, are performers whose minimal task is to keep the student sufficiently engaged, hopefully in learning activities, so that they do not take over control of the classroom or become chaotic. The task is difficult enough without having someone else in the room who may not only be a disruptive force but also a potential critic of one's performance. It probably would be impossible for a teacher to feel that an observer who is not an apprentice teacher is anything but an evaluator, since most observers, such as the principal or someone from the central office are evaluators. Even at the end of the field research period, at a party held by the investigators for the teachers and staff in one research site, the person making the thank-you speech joked about feelings associated with the investigators being in the room on a "bad day." Teachers in another school often apologized for their classes' behavior, claiming it was not typical.

To some extent, the teachers' perception of the observers as evaluators was not totally unrealistic, given the nature of the studies. Particularly since they knew that the focus was desegregation, that black-white relations in the schools are a political issue, and that it might be difficult to conceal the identity of the school, it was reasonable to worry about the investigators' access to potentially sensitive information. A charge of racism leveled at a teacher on the basis of data could bring that individual a great amount of difficulty.

Considerable effort was expended in building rapport with the teachers and gaining their trust so that they would speak and act freely in the researchers' presence. Several factors appeared crucial to achieving this goal, including non-interference in events in the classroom, a non-judgmental and sympathetic attitude, and careful guarding of confidentiality and reciprocity. Again, the success the investigators had in building and maintaining a role that gave them access to crucial information is best attested to by the type of information teachers made available to them. For example, one teacher told one investigator that she had purposely miscounted votes in a student council election so that a "responsible child" (a white male) would win rather than an "unstable child" (a black female). The teacher said that she was uncertain about the appropriateness of this action and therefore did not plan to tell even other teachers about it.

For the students, the investigators were curiosities--adults in the school, and therefore teachers, who never taught. One student solved this dilemma the first year by referring to the investigators as "watcher teachers." Because of this role attribution they were thought to be spies who would report evil doings to a teacher or principal. Eventually this conceptualization passed and was then replaced with the role of anthropologist, whose goal was "writing a book about the school."

One day at lunch, a student treated one of the researchers to the specter that all the students were modifying their behavior just for their benefit. Normally, she argued, the blacks would not sit near or interact with the whites, but rather would look at them in hostile ways, which she demonstrated on the white girl sitting next to her.

Fortunately for the researcher's sanity, she went on to explain that she and the other had modified their behavior at first, but stopped after they got used to the researchers.

The following example illustrates the success the investigators had in cultivating a relatively unobtrusive role:

> Today as I entered the sixth grade house as classes were changing, I saw Richard and another black male whom I don't know tussling. After glancing at me, Richard's companion drew away from him and leaned over as if to pick up his books on the floor. Richard said, "Aw, come on, she just writes. She never does anything." He then gave his companion a light shove and they were at it again.

Limitations of the studies. The advantages of the case study approach include within them its weaknesses. The in-depth view, the longer time span, and the exploratory insights are all gained at the sacrifice of numerous cases or careful control and manipulation of the variables as is possible with survey and experimental research.

When ethnographic studies are made of only one school, it is difficulty to claim that the results would be comparable to what is happening in other schools. The findings of each of the studies discussed in this report, when taken alone, do not have some of the power to generalize that survey and experimental studies can claim. However, the purpose of ethnographic research in a context such as school desegregation, in which variations and alternatives are unknown, is not to describe a typical desegregated school. Rather, it is to describe a desegregated school so that a case may be provided for comparison with other cases and so that initial formulations and insights about the process of desegregation may be developed that will provide a basis for the formulation of meaningful questions to be asked (perhaps using a survey strategy) in a broader sample of schools. This is what we are attempting to do in this report.

A Note on Confidentiality

Another problem of doing research in an institution in one's own society is that there is a greater potential that the research findings will affect the situation that one has studied. This is all to the good if the results are used in a beneficial and constructive manner. In a situation as politicized as school desegregation, however, it is quite possible that the data might be used against selected individuals in the ongoing negotiation of the emergent system. This, of course, is not the intent of the researchers, and to that end we have tried to disguise the schools and districts in which the studies were conducted, primarily by using pseudonyms, attempting to omit distinguishing characteristics that are not crucial to the findings, and by integrating some of the findings of the several studies.

SUMMARY

A Fieldwork Manual for Studying Desegregated Schools (Cassell 1978) provides basic instructions for the novice. It was produced on the basis of lengthy open-ended interviews with the investigators of the present set of projects and so deals with actual procedures rather than methodological ideals. Included therein is a bibliographic guide to the literature on fieldwork, especially in relationship to studies of schools. The length of the bibliography testifies to the intense interest of anthropolgists and sociologists in the use of the set of research methodologies known variously a participant observation, ethnographic fieldwork, qualitative methods, or -- simplest of all --fieldwork.

From the perspective of the methodology and philosophy of science, there has been considerable analysis of fieldwork. Among other explications of the philosophical bases of the method there is the notable collection of essays by Blumer (1969) as well as works by Becker, Cicourel, Seeley, and Strauss; also pertinent is the collection of essays assembled by Truzzi. Many anthropologists ground themselves in the methodological statements of Devereaux (1967), Evans-Pritchard (1962), and Geertz (1973). Most sociological fieldworkers filiate themselves to either the Symbolic Interactionist tradition traced to George Herbert Mead or the Phenomenological tradition traced to Alfred Schutz and Edmund Husserl. Nevertheless, it is possible to situate fieldwork within more positivistic traditions of the philosophy of science.

Fieldwork has an especial utility in dealing with complex and novel situations occurring within a natural whole, such as a school. More formalized and rigid procedures, such as surveys, assume a basic knowledge of the situation, which often is lacking and must be hazarded by the researcher. But, in such emergent situations as desegregating schools, it is not safe for the researcher to assume knowledge of the viewpoints and argot of the significant actors. Pencil and paper tests administered to students in classrooms are not efficient devices for acquiring information about the interaction among students in hallways, toiletrooms, cafeterias, and playgrounds. Nor do such tests reveal the transactions that really occur within the classroom. Surveys can imply a specious precision and lure the investigator into accepting as empirical reality what is but an artifact of an inadequate research instrument.

Research is more appropriate when it is directed at problems, and utilizes a variety of methods appropriate to the task. Triangulation among the findings of these several methods yields results which are of greater validity than when reliance is given to one method alone because it appears to be scientific and objective.

III. RESEARCH SITES

The findings discussed in this report are the results of ethnographic studies of desegregated schools in five different urban areas.[5] The following descriptions may appear to emphasize the differences among the urban areas and schools studies; but, on reflection, the reader will be struck by the many similarities that occur among the research sites. Within the changing character of our urban areas each site represents a microcosm of the struggle of minority groups for equal rights. While there is a history of minority suppression in the cities discussed, each city has recently experienced an upsurge in minority group power, both political and economic.

Throughout these studies one is struck by the constantly expressed fear that desegregation can only result in violence. Later in this report, we will discuss how often these fears have been unjustified. But, perhaps as a result of these fears and the loss of power experienced by whites in urban areas, the fact is that the movement of whites out of inner-cities may have been accelerated; in any case, their outmigration changes the composition and character of the schools discussed in this report.

For each research site we will attempt to briefly describe the city--its racial and class composition, economic and power bases, the history of desegregation, and the community response to it. We will then go on to describe the ecological location of the school in relation to the community it serves. Finally we will describe the school itself.

Memphis: Crossover High School

Memphis, located on the Mississippi River in the extreme southwest corner of Tennessee, historically developed as a commercial and banking center for the highly productive agricultural region of the Mississippi Delta. Over the years vast quantities of cotton, soybeans, and hardwood lumber--the major products of the region--have been shipped from Memphis to national markets. Service industry, headed by a large regional medical complex, and an extensive warehousing industry provided employment for a large unskilled and nonunionized working class.

However, the post-World War II economic miracle that swept much of the nation and several southern urban areas provided few benefits for Memphis. The city suffered a series of economic setbacks. By the late 1950's manufacturing facilities in Memphis were quite limited. Most large plants, such as those operated by Firestone, International Harvester, or General Electric, contained no corporate (or divisional) business functions within the city, and other manufacturing facilities tended to be relatively small. City and regional leadership was dominated by local banking and real estate interests, which were very powerful in the area's economy but without influence in the national economy.

The large-scale desegregation of the 1970's arrived only after a long agonizing decade in which the city was rocked by severe racial and labor strife followed by street confrontations and riots, and finally the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

After nearly eleven years of litigation and continuing confrontation, the students who finally came together at Crossover High School must have had some grave expectations of their future in education. For most of those eleven years a major topic around the family table was school desegregation. The many pronouncements by the radical fringe of the community had been well publicized for youthful consumption. The only exposure most whites had ever had to blacks was in subservient roles. Most blacks had never even driven through white neighborhoods. For the middle-class blacks the opportunity to attend an all-white school presented a hope for better employment and improved education. But many students from low-income families never understood why they had to leave their neighborhood to attend a school that was not "their own." As one black graduating senior said after attending Crossover High School for three years, "I don't know why they closed our school, it was good. It is just another way white folks have of messin' over us, I guess."

Of course, this was not the intention. Rather, the hope was that blacks and whites from two separate neighborhoods would learn to live together. Crossover High draws its population from two quite discrete neighborhood--Feeder, a mostly poor black area, and Crossover, a middle- to upper-middle class, all white neighborhood.

Feeder is a highly viable community with a stable population of homeowning (single unattached dwellings) citizens. When first entering the Feeder neighborhood, one is struck by its rural character. Residents are friendly and concerned about what is taking place on their street. Small garden plots are common in the yards of single unit homes. Many folk continue some ties with rural kin and maintain membership in country churches.

A large part of the working force is employed in service industries, such as the city sanitation department and as maids and janitors in hospitals, schools, and other institutions. Low wages are the norm for this type of employment; according to the 1970 census data, 25.4 percent of the Feeder residents have income below the poverty level. The work, however, provides a stable income, also reflected in the 1970 census listing, that has made it possible for the 395 out of 815 black heads of household (or almost 50%) to own their own homes.

In addition to single-family houses and a few older one-story duplex type apartments, other housing in the neighborhood consists mostly of an apartment complex. Residents of these apartments are, by definition of the Federal Government, low income. This means that the families are receiving some type of welfare payment, either as the sole source of income or as a supplement to low income from unstable unemployment. A man who is familiar with many of the families said, "These people are working just to survive."

The neighborhood school of Feeder was a strong unifying force in the Feeder community. The school has gained a reputation for outstanding athletic teams and marching bands. (Many of the alumni from the athletic teams of the 1960s are now playing professional football and basketball.) Business and parent groups such as Band Parents, Booster Club, and PTA were active and ball games drew capacity crowds (Collins and Noblitt 1977). The staff of the school and the community had a good relationship with each other.

In contrast to the relative homogeneity and closeness that characterized Feeder, the Crossover community was and is a larger, more mixed population in socioeconomic status. When they were constructed after World War II, the homes ranged from extremely modest small two and three bedroom bungalows to extremely wealthy, rambling mansions complete with large lots and, often, servant quarters. Generally the children from the families occupying the affluent section have always attended private schools. The families occupying the modest homes once represented a striving, socially mobile population of lower management types and small shop owners.

Crossover High, the all-white school that served the area and that was destined to be paired with Feeder High, was located on the border of the community. It was just across the tracks from the Feeder community, roughly two blocks away. Built in 1948 with facilities to serve a school population from first through twelfth grades, or 2,000 students, it graduated its first class in 1951. The plant was more elaborate than any school in the school system up to that time. Sitting in the center of a rolling hill, surrounded by a large park area, the school had many extras, including large stone columns at the entrance, marble hall interior, large classrooms, and a modern cafeteria. It was known throughout the system for its strong college preparatory program. In short, the structure, decor, and academic programs of the school fit the affluent neighborhood it was built to serve.

In 1972, the school of Feeder (k - 12) was desegregated and paired with Crossover. Initially, upon desegregation, Crossover had a student body that was 50 percent white and 50 percent black. In addition to this racial balance, it had a mix of students representing the various socioeconomic groups of both races in the city. Children came from families of the upper-middle class, the working class, as well as from the recent migrants to the city from rural areas. The residence patterns are such that it has been necessary to bus only a few children to achieve a minimal racial balance.

Although its academic programs and physical structure were important factors in retaining some whites in the beginning, other factors are working to change the racial composition of the school. Unlike residents of the Feeder community, who looked to their school as a center of community activity, the residents of Crossover tended to look to their churches, which draw membership from throughout the city, to provide recreational and social activities. Thus, the whites in Crossover never developed a strong neighborhood or community identity. Furthermore, the white churches were able to set up private, essentially segregated, schools that could take over when the local schools were desegregated. This, combined with low property taxes, resulted in over 35,000 white students withdrawing from the public schools when mass desegregation was finally ordered by the Federal District Court in 1971. At Crossover the racial balance was roughly 50-50 in 1972-73, but by 1976-77, the school was becoming predominantly black, with 70 percent black students and 30 percent white.

Since leaving, these white families have subsequently attempted to lower the status of public schools by derogating those parents who have elected to keep their children in public school for philosophical or financial reasons. As we shall see later in this report, these white

students and parents suffer status deprivation. It can be argued that this social factor is more critical in continued "school flight" than the quality of education.[6]

Bradford: Grandin Elementary School

The characteristics of Bradford, a moderate sized southern city, form the context in which the schools must operate. These features have their bases in the growth and development of Bradford as an industrial center.

Beginning in the 1860s, several tobacco processing firms were established in Bradford; development of the industry was rapid and the local entrepreneurs amassed considerable fortunes as Bradford grew into a tobacco center. The subsequent growth of the city was built on the foundation of capital established by these early firms.

Very early in its history, Bradford exhibited a pattern of great disparity in socioeconomic status between major segments of its population, that is, between the industrial owners and operators and the large numbers of unskilled, blue-collar laborers in the various factories and mills. This pattern persisted for many years and was the initial basis for socioeconomic divisions still visible at present.

Bradford was probably not very different from most other southern cities in having a dual system of black and white businesses and community structures. However, in Bradford, black business was quite successful. As their companies grew, these businessmen turned to the market among blacks outside of Bradford. The distinctive results of these successful ventures were that the black community in the city developed a strong economic base that was (more or less) financially independent of the local white business interests; correspondingly, a middle class composed of workers in the insurance companies, banks, and other enterprises arose in the black community.

Currently, socio-economic status and race are still reflected in residential patterns in the Bradford area. Most of the low income families are located in the city. The construction of subsidized-rent housing projects for low- and moderate-income families during the 1960s and 1970s have further concentrated these families in particular areas of the city. Racial segregation is found, especially in many of the lower-income sections with most of the low-income black families located in traditionally black areas in the southern part of the city. In general, the black segment of the population is concentrated in the city, where blacks constitute 38 percent of the city population of approximately 100,000.

In contrast to the concentration of low-income groups, the surrounding county area seems to be the focus of middle-class settlement. The county population is predominantly white (83.3%), although there is apparently a growing segment of upper-middle and middle income black families.

The economic and demographic conditions experienced in the Bradford area during the past twenty years have had their effect on the schools. The concentration of large numbers of white middle-class residents in the urban fringe and in the "city-out" area of the county district has increased the enrollment in county schools while enrollment in the city

system has declined. The city schools have become more black and less "rich," that is, the average income levels of families whose children are attending Bradford schools are lower than those of families in the past.

Insofar as municipal politics are concerned, the strength of the blacks has a basis in the changing demographic situation. This is especially true concerning public school affairs. The increasing proportion of blacks in Bradford and in the city schools has resulted in a corresponding increase in their influence on city affairs. This general increase, combined with the black community's particular interests in education; led to the election of four blacks out of five board members when the board was reorganized in 1975.

Development of a desegregation plan did not come easily. The school board members were conscious of not only the political interests of Bradford leadership in the desegregation process but also of the tension and potential disruptiveness in the lower-level community groups. Both black and white parents in segregated neighborhoods (whose children attended essentially segregated schools) were fearful of the outcome of school desegregation, of the potential for violence, of the (felt to be) unknown consequences of "racial mixing," and of the possible detrimental effects of desegregation on the quality of their children's education.

Given a recognition of the obvious tension and the "highly emotional tone" of the community's discussion of the imminent desegregation, the school board seems to have made some formal efforts to permit community input in the formation of the plan. These were accomplished through open school board meetings and a public hearing on the proposed plan. Some of these scenes were apparently quite tumultuous.

But a number of informants indicate that in general the system was resistant to the input of community groups at more than a superficial level. Many groups in Bradford feel that the school system was unresponsive to their community's interests and the needs and demands of children (and their parents) in the schools. It was felt that the school system demonstrated a lack of leadership, initiative, and innovative approach in dealing with desegregation and the changes faced by the schools. Furthermore, many parents felt there was a general decline in the quality of education their children were receiving. The response of some white parents to the growth of problems in the local schools was to see the poor condition as directly associated with the increased presence of black children (many from low-income families) in the classrooms.

This led many parents to seek alternatives for their children. The development of private schools for the purpose of maintaining parent-controlled and/or segregated educational facilities has occurred simultaneously with the desegregation process in the South in general. As in Memphis, Bradford informants reported that the majority of the present private and parochial institutions were established in direct response to efforts to form a unitary school system. For example, one parent states that when a preliminary plan was prepared and the figures released indicated that there would be a large influx of blacks into the school her children were attending, she received a telephone call the same day advising her that a new private school would be established for her and other parents' children.

It was in this context that the Grandin Elementary School was desegregated. The first desegregation directive to affect Grandin came in 1970 when the school was paired with a black elementary school located about three miles away. This arrangement called for the combined school populations to attend kindergarten at their "neighborhood" school, grades 1-3 at Maryvale, the previously black school, and then go to Grandin for grades 4-6. When this pairing occurred, children of somewhat dissimilar backgrounds were brought together in school. According to information obtained from the 1970 Census, the community originally served by Grandin is less than 25 percent black and median family income for families living in the area is between $6,000 and $12,000. Most adults are employed as industrial (skilled) workers. A few are professionals and businessmen. Less than a quarter of the households are run by females. No substandard houses or housing projects were identified in the community.

From the time it opened until the 1970-71 school year, Grandin served the surrounding white community exclusively. All the teachers and students were white and many lived within walking distance of the school. During that period, especially prior to the middle 1960s, the school had a good reputation among the city's white population. White teachers who had been in the school or the school system during the 1960s report that at that time students' standardized test scores were above the national average, no one received a free lunch or breakfast, and there were many "enrichment" activities, such as field trips and after-school activities.

In contrast, the community originally served by Maryvale is predominantly black. The median family income, which is less than $5999, is lower than in the Grandin area. While industrial workers comprise a substantial share of the work force in the Grandin area, unskilled laborers and unemployed workers are more common in the Maryvale neighborhood. About 50 percent of Maryvale residents live in female-headed households. Fifty percent of the housing units have been identified as substandard and several public housing projects are located in the area.

In 1975, when the most recent desegregation plan went into effect, Grandin received students from still a third community where the neighborhood school had been closed as part of the new plan. The population in this community, called Hartwell, is more evenly balanced in terms of racial composition with blacks and whites both comprising about 50 percent. In terms of economic characteristics, the Hartwell area resembles the Grandin community. The median family income range and the occupational profile are the same for the two areas. At the time that Hartwell students started attending Grandin, however, the public school population from the area consisted primarily of black students from low income families whose backgrounds were similar to those of Maryvale students.

During the 1970-71 school year, 44 percent of the students enrolled at Grandin were black. The percentage of blacks at Maryvale was higher--59 percent. The percentage of blacks at each school grew steadily over the years. By 1973, 58 percent of Grandin's students and 63 percent of Maryvale's were black. In the Fall of 1975, when a new desegregation plan went into effect that required that the proportion of blacks and whites at each school reflect the overall black-white ratio

in the school district, Grandin's black population increased to 65 percent, Maryvale's to almost 80 percent. At the same time that the student bodies were desegregated, some faculty desegregation was also occurring. Several black teachers came to Grandin in 1970 and more have arrived since.

At Grandin there is clearly a feeling that more than just the racial composition of the school has changed since desegregation. Standardized test scores are now below the national average, and many students require remedial help in reading and math. The majority of students (80%) now receive free lunches and at least one teacher keeps a used clothes box for children who need extra clothing in the winter.

While there is some indication that the reputation of the school began to fall prior to desegregation, a feeling that the school has declined, primarily as a result of desegregation, to the point that it no longer stands out among Bradford's elementary schools, seems to be shared and regretted by most teachers and parents of children who were at school prior to desegregation. However, in interviews conducted with a number of parents whose children were at Grandin during the course of the investigation, both blacks and whites expressed general agreement that Grandin offers a good academic program. Furthermore, while many black and white parents recounted their initial fears for the safety of their children at the newly desegregated school, they were pleased that no violence had occurred. Fears about safety seemed, for the most part, to have dissipated by the time of the study.

In comparing Grandin to other schools, white parents seem most concerned about the social effects of sending their children to a school with only a handful of other students perceived to have similar interests, experiences, and abilities. Dissatisfaction with this situation is often cited as the primary reason why white parents move to the county or put their children in private schools. The same white parent who called Grandin the "best school in Bradford" also stated that if contact with blacks should result in her daughter marrying a black [her daughter] might as well be dead."

Black parents express concern about the possibility of black/white tensions in the school and worry that their children may be discriminated against in favor of whites; however, most, in talking specifically about Grandin, state that they feel these problems are no more of an issue at Grandin than at other city schools, and less of an issue than at county schools. They noted that they and their children had been afraid of what would happen to them at Grandin after it was first desegregated but said things were much better now that there were more blacks there.

Waterford: Wexler Middle School

Waterford is a large industrial northeastern city that contains a rich variety of ethnic groups, including substantial numbers of Italians and Irish, as well as sizable communities of Polish, Slovaks, and other European groups. Just over 20% of the city's population is black. A large majority of the black population lives in heavily segregated and economically depressed neighborhoods. But there is a black middle class that has a noticeable impact on local politics. Although Waterford experienced some race related civil disorders during the 1960s, they

were not severe compared to those in cities like Los Angeles, Detroit or Boston.

Forty-two percent of the students in Waterford's schools are black. However, over one-half of the city's schools have enrollments that are extremely heavily segregated (over 90% black or white). Waterford has been under some pressure from the state government to desegregate since the late 1960s. Nevertheless, to date the city has not come up with a plan acceptable to the state. Although the racially mixed (but white dominated) school board has strongly emphasized its commitment to desegregation in numerous public pronouncements, it has also consistently been opposed to any desegregation plan that would involve large scale bussing of students. Given the residental patterns in the city, it is extremely difficult to see how thorough going desegregation can be achieved without considerable busing.

There appears to be a difference in the desire of blacks and whites for desegregation. Historically, a high proportion of the black population has favored desegregation, although much of Waterford's black population is not enthusiastic about bussing. But there is little popular support of either desegregation or bussing from the white community. Certainly the fact that Waterford's predominantly white school board has been unable to come up with a desegregation plan in spite of state pressures over the course of almost a decade is significant.

Even among those parents who favor desegregation, the extent to which they value interracial schooling as opposed to tolerating it varies widely. For example, on a local television special about Wexler aired in November, 1975 right after the school's opening, only one of the five parents speaking, a black woman, specifically gave the fact that the school was interracial as a major reason for enrolling her child there. The other parents, both black and white, stressed the academic programs. One of the white parents said that she had been locked into sending her child to Wexler because she wanted the child, who had been admitted to a special program for gifted children, to participate in it. Hence, Wexler's interracial student body was not a major attraction for all parents, or perhaps even for most parents. However, the fact remains that in the 1975-76 school year all parents of children in the school were sufficiently accepting of interracial schooling that they sent their child to Wexler despite the fact that essentially segregated schools were readily available, and despite a rumor circulated through the white community that, because of bad behavior, over 100 children, mostly black, had been expelled from a summer program designed to familiarize students with each other and the school. (The belief that serious racial problems were inevitable was strengthened by the fact that in 1967 another local school that had been much praised for its innovative programs and racial mix unexpectedly experienced serious racial violence.)

As we will see later in this report, the fear of violence was never justified, at least at Wexler. Perhaps this can be explained partially by the physical location of the school. The school is not located on traditionally white or black territory. It sits on a large tract of land that is bounded by a factory with a racially mixed work force, a government building, a public park, and small stores that are on the periphery of one of the most desegregated shopping areas in the city.

Beyond these immediate racially neutral boundaries, a white residential area fans out to the west and a black area spreads to the east. One of the reasons the school board purchased this particular tract of land was its easy access from both black and white residential areas.

In addition to being located on a piece of land that is not clearly white or black territory, the school was interracial from the day it opened its doors in September, 1975. Hence, children of one group were not confronted with having to make a place for themselves in an already functioning social system dominated by the other group and permeated with its attitudes and values. Although not equal to the student body black/white ratio, the faculty was nearly 25% black, far more interracial than most other schools in the district.

Another fundamental decision made by the school board while Wexler was still in the planning stages, was that Wexler's racial balance would be obtained through open enrollment of students graduating from 24 elementary schools in the northern third of the city. Although the opening of this school obviously could do relatively little to relieve the pervasive segregation in the city's school system, it was hoped that it could serve as a model of high quality integrated education.

The Board decided that students would be admitted to Wexler on a first-come first-serve basis within predetermined quotas set to achieve racial and sexual balance. The goal was to obtain a student body approximately 58% white and 42% black, which would exactly mirror the black/white ratio in the entire school system. When the school opened its doors, however, the student body was approximately 47% white and 53% black. The deviation from the Board's initial goal reflected the fact that many whites were dubious about enrolling their children in a racially mixed school. But although Wexler did not attract as many whites as it had hoped for, it came relatively close to meeting its goal. What attracted whites to the school? Interviews with students and parents suggest that two major factors motivated white students to attend Wexler: 1) Its unusually strong academic program, and 2) its outstanding physical facilities and equipment that make possible an extraordinarily broad array of nonacademic programs.

For the Northern part of the city, Wexler is the home of a prestigious eighth grade scholar's program, a special accelerated program for students with measured IQ's exceeding 130. When arguing in favor of locating this program at Wexler, the superintendent of schools pointed out specifically that this would help the school to attract students. The school also has an experimental enrichment program for talented sixth and seventh graders. In addition, the school will offer more team teaching and individualization of instruction than is available in most other Waterford middle schools.

Wexler cost over 12 million dollars to build and its high cost is reflected in its unusually fine physical facilities. For example, the school has athletic facilities including a swimming pool and tennis courts comparable to or better than most high schools in the city, let alone the junior high schools. Also illustrative of the school's unusual facilities and programs is its media center--three rooms including a production studio and a control room in which students use regular television cameras, lights, and sound equipment to produce programs for transmission throughout the school on an internal closed-circuit system.

In the spring of 1976, less than a year after Wexler first opened, the Waterford school board made a decision that may have far reaching consequences. The open-enrollment policy was replaced by a plan in which children graduating from 11 elementary schools were required to attend Wexler. Other children were permitted to enroll under a few special circumstances, such as having a sibling who had entered the school under the earlier open-enrollment plan.

This policy change had two very noticeable effects. First, the number of children in Wexler's sixth grade increased from approximately 450 to just over 600. Second, the new sixth grade was over two-thirds black rather than just half black. The change in enrollment policy may have important implications for the school's future. It has clearly created quite a new social situation in the classrooms of the affected grades. Also, there is concern on the part of many that the school will come to be perceived as a black school rather than a integrated school and that whites will find ways to avoid it. At this time, it is still too early to assess the impact of the new enrollment on the school. However, Wexler's future as an integrated school seems much more problematic under the new policy than it did under the old.

New York City: Sheridan High School

Sheridan High School draws its student population from several distinct and widely dispersed neighborhoods of Manhattan. Understanding Sheridan as a social system requires describing these neighborhoods and situating them as parts of the vast whole that is the New York Metropolitan Area. The patterns of interaction inside the school cannot be understood apart from the patterns of interaction in the larger community. Let us begin with the question of what it means to live in Manhattan, as opposed to other boroughs of the city.

New York City draws to it some of the richest and most powerful and some of the most wretched and oppressed people in the world. The borough of Manhattan contains a heavy proportion of these two extremes, often living in close proximity to one another. The overwhelming ecological constraint on life in Manhattan is the island's sheer density of population and development. In the outer boroughs, particularly Queens, one may find orderly rows of single-family dwellings inhabited by people of similar social class and often of similar ethnic background as well.

In Manhattan, by contrast, the density of apartment dwellings, and the crazy-quilt of land values that results from speculation on some of the most valuable land in the world, produce a much different situation. The dwellings of the very rich, the very poor, and of the embattled middle class of many cultural backgrounds may be located within a few blocks of each other. The different classes and social groupings may not mix in schools, social clubs, even stores and restaurants, but they all share the same streets, or at least some of the same streets, for some of the same purposes. Under these circumstances, the kind of ethnically and socioeconomically homogeneous areal blocks that one may find in Queens or Staten Island are few.

Sheridan High is located between two concentrations of skyscrapers in the general area of Manhattan known as the Lower East Side. The old low-rise buildings of the area present a striking contrast to skyscraper

areas that bound it to north and south. The school draws its student population largely from the Lower East Side, but also from Harlem, an area to the north. The students from the Lower East Side often walk to school. The "uptown students" ride the subway downtown to school.

The Lower East Side and Central Harlem are similar in several respects but different in other crucial respects. Both neighborhoods are primarily residential and their building stock is chiefly composed of aging, deteriorated tenements and new high-rise public housing. The populations of the two neighborhoods also occupy similar niches in the metropolitan economy. A large proportion of these households receive some form of public assistance. The working segments of the population are less than 10% professional, technical, and managerial, and are dominated by unskilled and semi-skilled workers.

If the housing and employment profiles of Central Harlem and the Lower East Side are roughly similar, however, the cultural background of their populations varies greatly. Central Harlem's population is about 95% composed of American blacks and has been relatively stable over the past twenty years. The Lower East Side, by contrast, has experienced rapid turnover in the past 20 years and is characterized by great ethnic diversity, including Hispanics, Chinese, and whites. Other differences between the two areas include the better transportation facilities to and from Central Harlem and the larger proportion of manufacturing jobs and businesses serving non-local residents on the Lower East Side. The most striking difference between the two neighborhoods, however, remains the contrast between the more stable one-group population of Central Harlem and the flux and plurality of groups on the Lower East Side.

Within the Lower East Side, the degree of segregation of various groups in particular geographic concentrations varies a great deal, from the relatively closed, though expanding boundaries of Chinatown to the mixture of poor Puerto Ricans and middle class whites in high rise housing projects and the area around the school where the old housing is shared among blacks, elderly Jews, Puerto Ricans, and Chinese. There is also a major Hispanic concentration.

The ethnic diversity of the Lower East Side is also coupled with a greater degree of economic diversity than is found in Harlem. Restaurants, manufacturing, and retail enterprises are more numerous and diverse on the Lower East Side.

Thus, we see that patterns of interaction in the community within and across ethnic boundaries are pronounced and describable, although intricate. The neighborhoods that contribute to the school's population exhibit varied but definite patterns of ecological, economic, political, and social organization.

The high school itself contains anywhere from 3500 to 4200 students and covers an entire city block, standing six stories high; it has two annexes as well, one for the ninth and most of the tenth grade students located several blocks from the main building, and the other used for an alternative program, located on Wall Street.

Under the Board of Education plan, there are three types of high schools: academic-comprehensive, vocational-technical, and independent-alternative. Some of the academic-comprehensive schools are competitive, thereby restricting enrollment according to ability. Others, such as Sheridan, restrict enrollment through the feeder schools assigned to them. Other students wishing to attend these schools must get special

permission or prove they are moving to the communities that feed students into the school.

The resulting ethnic population for the school is:

Year	Black	Oriental	Spa. Sur.	Other
1971-72	25.1%	15.4	39.1	20.4
1972-73	25.3	15.5	40.5	18.7
1973-74	25.7	17.4	38.6	18.2
1974-75	21.2	19.0	45.4	14.4
1975-76	19.2	20.9	50.0	10.0

As can be noted, there has been a shift in the proportions representing each "gross" ethnic category. The same is not true for teachers, almost all of whom have always been white (usually about 88%).

The decline in the white ("other") attendance has to do with white-flight from the city, the aging of certain white ethnic populations so that there are fewer children, and an increase in the proportion of white children who attend private schools. Oriental ethnic groups and Spanish-surname ethnic groups have had a rise in the number of immigrants over the past few years. The drop in the number of black students at Sheridan is based on political problems with the feeder schools from one of the community districts assigned to feed Sheridan.

Sheridan, then, is not a "typical" desegregated, black/ white school, but a multiethnic one. Perhaps the struggles that go on there can only be understood within the context of political battles such as the one that is lowering the number of black students at Sheridan, and the struggle for ethnic identity and control in the city at large.

Because New York City has historically been the first stop for immigrants, the problems of integration (and assimilation) are far too complex to discuss in this brief report. Allow us to say simply that there has always been a demand for integration and control from whatever new group arrived. During each time of massive immigration there has been an upsurge in ethnic identification and ideology. Perhaps most important is the tradition of ethnic succession; as each new wave of immigration has occurred, the group preceding it has been assimilated into the general culture.

Let's start our discussion with the most recent battle, which can be traced back to the 1954 Supreme Court decision (Brown v. Topeka). While formulated in response to a southern system of segregation based on a juridical separation of racial groups, the decisions ultimately was extended to northern cities where segregation was indirect, based on the tradition of neighborhood schools.

The demand for integration by minority groups became increasingly political throughout the 1950's and early 1960's. The process of desegregation, however, was hindered at every step, and segregation of minorities actually increased over this period. There are two possible reasons why this was so. The first is that the demographic ratios in the city were changing rapidly. Like other cities discussed in this report, New York was experiencing a "white flight," partially as a result of attempts by parents to avoid sending their children to desegregated schools.

The second reason for the failure of desegregation during the 1950's and early 1960's can be related directly to policies of the school board (Rogers 1968). Very soon after the 1954 court decision, the school board declared a policy of integration. They commissioned studies, drew up policy statements, and designed various plans to achieve integration. At each step of implementation, however, they hedged. Transfer plans, open enrollment plans, building plans, all were announced and then either never implemented or were implemented in name only and to very little effect.

The Board's vacillations were conducted against a backdrop of rising political activism around the school. Community groups on both sides of the issue were learning effective political organization.

Beginning in 1966 at the famous Intermediate School 201 in Harlem, a new tactic came to replace the drive for integration. In historical perspective, however, it was not new. The leader of the I.S. 201 experiment demanded local control for the Harlem school and advocated a reorganization of the school's curriculum to emphasize "black culture" in place of what has been described as the "assimilationism of the common school concept" (Ravich, 1974).

After three years of negotiations, the bill that finally passed in 1969 was a comparatively weak measure. Locally elected school boards were established and given the power to choose superintendents and a small percentage of teachers in remedial programs. Otherwise the hiring procedure of the school board, which discriminated against non-white teachers, remained intact. The high schools were not included in decentralization and remained under the direct control of the school board.

In the late 1970's the city school system is again facing major changes. The student population has shifted over the past ten years from being predominantly white to predominantly black and Hispanic. Many students are non-native speakers of English and the schools have been mandated by the courts to provide bilingual education. In addition, the increasing reliance of middle- and upper-class families on private schooling has raised the poverty level of the public school student population to high proportions.

Faced with a changing client population, the school system is also facing a budget crisis. The resulting layoffs, based on seniority within the system, pitted young teachers against old, and newer immigrant group members against those that preceded them.

Recently there have been vows by those in office to have the school system politically restructured by the state legislature so that it is more directly under control of the mayor. Once again (cf Ravitch 1974) the control and organization of the school system is a major political issue and once again much of the turmoil is centered around issues of ethnicpolitics.

Pawnee: Pawnee West High School

Pawnee is a moderate sized city of 85,000 (1970 census) located on the northern fringe of a major midwestern industrial city. The residents are poor relative to their neighbors in the surrounding affluent county. The presence of three large factories has contributed to the growth pattern of Pawnee by attracting workers from various sections of the country, making Pawnee a town of remarkable ethnic and cultural divers-

ity for its size. At the latest census, the black population is approximately 23,000 (from 3,000 in 1940 and 7,000 at the end of World War II); the Hispanic population is a mixture of Mexican-Americans, Puerto Rican migrants and other Spanish speaking groups and is estimated to represent 10% of the total population of the city. The remaining white population is primarily rural southern and Appalachian white.

In many ways Pawnee is a southern town culturally in contrast to its obvious technological and northern position. Speech patterns as well as food customs suggest the strength of the southern background. This quality of small town influence, is particularly important in everyday interaction among both black and white residents.

Like the other cities we have discussed, Pawnee has experienced considerable loss of whites to nearby affluent suburbs during the past two decades, particularly as new expressways have made the surrounding villages attractive suburban location for residents of the larger industrial city nearby.

The economic recession has taken its toll on Pawnee, and the unemployment rate has hovered around 25% for several months, occasionally soaring to almost one out of three unemployed. The difficulties of Pawnee's industrial plants and the loss of Pawnee's importance as a commercial center are two indications of the serious economic problems that face the city. In the 1970 census the average family income of Pawnee was almost $1,000 below the national average, and poverty is a serious problem in the town.

One of the most dramatic changes in Pawnee during the past decade is the number of social settings in which there are mixed black and white contacts. If one observes exchanges in restaurants, stores, or entertainment centers, one is struck by the large number of desegregated settings that predominate within the community. This does not mean that the community is desegregated in all dimensions of life, or that problems of racism are missing. It does mean, however, that there are many empirical signs of a lessening of separation between the races and of the development of a more fully biracial society.

Desegregation took place during some of the lowest points in Pawnee's historical development. The city was reeling from the effects of white migration to the suburbs and black migration to the city; commercial decline due to location of a major shopping center outside the city and to the routing of a major highway bypassing Pawnee; acute housing deterioration caused partly by poor planning decisions adopted throughout a forty year period; and a sharp rise in social problems.

A bitter busing controversy was aggravated by the small-town atmosphere in which long-standing racial attitudes rose to the surface. But the publicity, the infusion of federal monies, and the political power of black leadership in spite of obstacles, contributed to an important transformation in local leadership. By 1970, black voters could not be ignored; federal regulations had to be enforced; and official policies had to be enacted, in spite of "old guard" reluctance to give up influence. One can now find black representatives in almost all divisions of the city government, although not usually in key policy-making positions. Recently, four black representatives were elected to the school board, constituting the majority.

The particular circumstances that surrounded the attempts to reduce the level of discrimination against blacks in various areas of life in Pawnee created considerable ambiguity among the local educators. Faced with mounting criticism from segments of the community and the disruptions that were part of that criticism, educators were forced to attend more to the issue of control and less to the issues of education. As one Pawnee staff member stated, "I'm not an educator; I'm a policeman." It was in this context that Pawnee's oldest high school moved into a new building. The physical characteristics of that building and the reactions of the community and the professional staff to that structure reflect the turmoil and ambiguity that plagued Pawnee.

The new building that houses Pawnee West is starkly modern in contrast to the traditional appearance of the old high school building that it replaced. It is a low, sprawling, gray concrete structure. On first view, one notices an apparent absence of windows, which gives the building what some informants have termed a "prison-like" appearance.

Much of the design of the school is an answer to a commonly held fear that desegregation would result in violence. Access to the different levels of the building and different areas on the same level is controlled by a series of steel and glass doors. These doors can be locked in crisis situations and are routinely locked when classes are not being held in the building. This practice, although it may have been seen as important for protecting the equipment in the building, makes the use of facilities by other people difficult. A case in point is the Parents Club at Pawnee West. A leader of the PTA stated:

> The difficulty of getting into the building and parking area are, we think, some of the reasons why people don't come [to the Parent Club meetings]. We think that if parking were a little easier and it was clearer how to get into the building that we might have more people at these meetings. We think that some people try to get in and are unsuccessful and then go home.

And another parent complained:

> The parents club is a rip-off...I tried seven doors before I was able to get in. I wouldn't come here at night anyway for the meetings. I was dropped off once in front in the circle [driveway] and I couldn't find a door that was open. I felt like melting into the sidewalk. I couldn't get in and I was afraid to go home. I wouldn't dream of walking home from here. I won't go out even if it looks like the sun is going down. So no way was I going to walk home.

Pawnee West is the only new construction in an area of what is feared to be imminent decline. Immediately to the west of the school is a predominantly white, but integrated, middle-class area that retains its reputation as "the best neighborhood in Pawnee" and immediately to the south is Pawnee's "ghetto" which most people agree is "one of the worst neighborhoods."

The neighborhoods on the south side of the city are severely depreciated. Houses are often in very poor states of repair and have

extremely low market value. Realtors in Pawnee report that an owner of a south side home cannot find a realtor to sell the house. The houses are assigned a value of $100 and so the commission on sales, if a buyer could be found, is so small that realtors will not handle the transaction. Most deals are transacted between relatives or friends and it is not uncommon for the owner to "give the house away."

The area to the west of Pawnee High, "the best section of town," has fared better. The houses, although old, continue to be well-maintained. Brick, Tudor, and wood frame houses sit on wooded lots where the lawns are well-trimmed and gardens are planted with flowers. The streets are treelined and quiet. It is a pleasant residential area that offers excellent housing values. Comparable housing in the surrounding townships will cost the buyer from $25,000 to $50,000 more than houses in this neighborhood. The area has managed to maintain its solidly middle class appearance. However, the residents are not unconcerned about their ability to maintain their neighborhood. One local community leader whose own children attend Pawnee schools recently advised a colleague not to purchase a home in Pawnee because of the problems of resale. This resident has taken several public stands about the importance of encouraging immigration into Pawnee especially by middle-class whites. The concern about the imminent decline of the neighborhood is common among residents who see the relatively low cost of housing as attractive to a lower-class population. The area is integrated along race lines but has been relatively homogeneous along class lines. Increasingly residents are aware of the difficulties in preserving the middle-class characteristics of the area. They wonder if this neighborhood will soon go the way of so many of the older sections of Pawnee.

This, then, is the neighborhood in which the Pawnee West building was constructed. The new building stands out for its very "newness" in an area that may be on the edge of serious decay. The contrast between the new structure and its neighborhood seems to underlie the concern for "screening out" influences from that community that cannot be controlled.

The decision to locate Pawnee West on its present site was no simple matter. The conflict hinged on what neighborhood would come to benefit from the location of the resources represented by the new building.

Two sites were proposed for the construction: one was an "inner-city" location to the south of the site of the present building in the severely depressed area; the other, recommended by the school board, was to the west and north on the grounds of the state hospital that stretch over several hundred acres on the western boundary of Pawnee. The "inner-city site" was favored by predominantly black groups since it was located closer to the largest concentration of black families. The whites in Pawnee were in favor of the Hospital site, "which was in a "safer" section farther away from the poor south side. The Board was forced to compromise on a location that was almost midway between the two sites.

The black community views the outcome of the site selection battle and the broader desegregation order as a victory--as evidence that they have wrested some control over the "system" in Pawnee. The importance

of control is realized by parents in both the black and white communities. For blacks, success in the battle for control represents preserving chances for "integrated education." One black parent, herself a West graduate, told an interviewer:

> Well, up until not too long ago, there was only one high school. That's why the high school has always been desegregated. That's why we fought so hard to keep the high school where it is because at one time that was the only high school that was here. You see that desegregation order upset many poeple here because the way the school district had the boundary lines. Black kids didn't get a chance to go to school wth white kids until they were in high school; there were all black schools. The elementary school and junior high school which had all black students but when students were ready for high school, they went to the only one we had.

This parent values "integrated education" because, for her, it means her child will get a better education. Many white parents also say that the situation is better as a result of the fight to desegregate the schools.

But, still, Pawnee West has become identified as the "black high school" and residents of the black community have become attached to it. Part of the pride of the black community can be attributed to Pawnee West's reputation as being the best high school in Pawnee, the school "where the good kids went" to get their education. Although many teachers think the quality of education has gone down since desegregation, many students seem to agree with one informant who told the investigators that West has "really good, super curriculum programs."

The real "curriculum" in which the community has pride deals with social relationships. At Pawnee West students are learning "how to cope with other people from different situations, backgrounds and things like that." One graduate, a white male, told us that this kind of learning had given him a "real advantage" over students from a predominantly white school:

> ...you could take a kid from Pawnee West and you could put him in almost any situation and any social situation and, although he may not exactly fit it, he will be aware enough to where he can kind of smooth off some of these rough edges and get on and keep himself out of trouble.

Another white, female student currently attending West summed it up this way:

> ...you can learn your ABC's and coloring anywhere but I think Pawnee West prepares you more for life.

Below we will discuss the findings from the sites and the ways in which these schools prepare their students for life.

SUMMARY

The five schools selected for study were among the best in their districts. Three (Crossover, Pawnee, Wexler) enjoyed relatively new buildings, and the first and last of these were outstanding in their physical facilities. All five schools had earned good or high reputations for academic excellence: Crossover had been almost a preparatory academy for the white upper classes of Memphis; Grandin had been among the better schools of Bradford; Pawnee had a solid reputation for its area; Sheridan was considered among the better high schools of Manhattan; and Wexler had been designed as a magnet school in Waterford.

As desegregation loomed (Crossover, Grandin, Pawnee, Wexler), the communities affected became agitated and subject to rumors of imminent violence. The worst outbreaks occurred in Pawnee; elsewhere there was agitation and some white flight. In fear of that violence the administrations imposed severe disciplinary controls. The most extreme case was Pawnee, where the lunch period was abolished, so that students would not congregate in the cafeteria, and where extra-curricular programs were reduced or eliminated.

As desegregation proceeded, these schools lost considerable numbers of their white students. The process was rapid at Crossover and Wexler, slower at the Grandin and Sheridan, and perhaps slowest of all at Pawnee. Concomitantly with the loss of white students went an alteration in curriculum, away from "academics." In the most extreme case (Crossover), the honors curriculum was dismantled, and emphasis given to vocational and general education. At Wexler, as the school was opened for general enrollment from black ghetto areas, its status as the locus for elite (honors) programs seemed destined to disappear, in the situation of overcrowding.

Several of the schools are suffering from budgetary pressures. Wexler is overcrowded. Pawnee's building is being utilized in a fashion far other than intended by its architects and planners. These constrictions affect the experiences of the students. As we shall see in a later chapter, extra-curricular activities have not proven to be an area for interracial integration; nevertheless, there can be no possibility of their ever performing such a function if they are suspended for fear of violence (or to keep the budget low).

IV. ADMINISTRATION AND TEACHERS

The Relationship of the School to the District and the Community

As we have seen in the preceding chapter, the social, political, and economic characteristics of cities form the context in which the schools operate; the nature of the student population derives from the cities' residential patterns and demographic features, and their economic and political situation establishes the arena for school system operations. Political interest groups, school board members, school administrators, community leaders, and parents have all, in various ways, been involved in fashioning the course of school desegregation in the cities discussed in this report.

In their attempts to implement desegregation, as well as other social and educational changes, the groups and their members place numerous demands on individual schools. Often, however, these demands conflict. Individual schools and their administrators are at the receiving end of a hierarchically-structured system, making them, in many cases, responsible for somehow accommodating the myriad demands that come their way. Most often the demands are aimed at making a school conform to certain expectations held by the wider system. Through these demands, the wider system attempts to control what goes on in individual schools.

School board demands. One source of demands to which the school must be responsive is the school board and school administration. Directives from school boards most often come in the form of descriptions of programs to be implemented, information to be acquired, or rules to be followed. The following excerpt from field notes taken at Grandin provides an example of such a demand.

> Today at the teachers' meeting, Mr. Phillips explained to the teachers the instructions given to him and the other 18 principals for the "read-in." At the meeting, also attended by the superintendent, the principals were asked to see that a "read-in" is held every day in their schools at a set period. The "read-in" activity, which is to last twenty minutes, is to give children the opportunity to learn to enjoy reading. The activity is to be uninterrupted by other activities; the children are to have freedom to choose the books they wish to read; they are not to be coerced into reading, and they are to have role models in the form of the teachers and the principal in that everyone is to be engaged in reading during this period.

The "read-in" was difficult to implement because the scheduling of activities at Grandin is quite complicated. Furthermore, teachers wondered how possible it would be to maintain an atmosphere of relaxed reading in classes in which some of the students cannot read. Therefore, the scheduling decision was a compromise. It was decided that a formal read-in period would be set aside three days a week; the inclusion of read-in periods the other two days was left up to the discretion of the teacher.

The read-in is only one small example of how a school board influences an individual school. Decisions about textbooks to use, curricula to follow, supplies and equipment to have available, food to eat, types of grades (or student evaluations) to give, how often to give grades, what kinds of records to keep, and many more are made by school boards. They also offer advice and rules about what to do if students are absent, sick, failing, or behaving poorly. They require teachers and principals to attend workshops, go to meetings, and join committees. Still other regulations that can originate from school boards and their administrations include directives either to institute tracking (as in Crossover and Sheridan) or to do away with self-contained, ability grouped classes (as in Grandin and Wexler). Finally, there are many directives aimed at satisfying the courts over desegregation.

Budget demands. Another constraint, one that is determined by the school board but ultimately affects the school and its administrators, is money. The school budget affects, in part, the curriculum, staffing, and even the kind of records that must be kept. Furthermore, the composition of the budget generally comes from a variety of funding sources (Federal, state, local government, special programs) all of which depend on various funding formulas. Because these formulas calculate funding according to school or regional specific characteristics, these characteristics (such as attendance, rates, student SES, native language) become determinants for school resources.

In this fashion, the school is controlled by various external bureaucracies that, in granting monies, also gain the right to regulate the use of these funds. They specify how the money can be spent, what can be taught, and so forth.

One example of the power that budget constraints can have is the effect of the New York City budget crisis on hiring practices. Because only a limited number of teachers can be hired, and because of the oversupply of qualified teachers, a system has been devised that places applicants on a rank-ordered list. In some districts these lists are so long that qualifying tests have not been given for a number of years. Because minority members are usually younger, this situation has stratified the teaching staff at Sheridan by both age and ethnicity. Because of recent school board directives that bilingual education be made available, however, there has been some hiring of minority teachers and, in fact, the largest number of minority teachers are found in the language programs.

Community demands. The decision by the New York City Board of Education to institute programs for bilingual education was made only after continual pressure from groups within the community, particularly Hispanics. This pressure eventually resulted in a court decision and civil rights regulations that forced the Board to act.

In fact, pressure from community groups can have a great effect on the style and manner in which a school is run, and, ultimately, on the kind of education the children receive.

In several of the cities discussed in this report, for example, there was a prevailing fear among members of the community that desegregation would result in violence and, perhaps even more important, that controlling the children and "keeping a lid on" was just as crucial as educating them. In Pawnee this attitude went so far as to affect the physical space and design of the school.

Pressure from Memphis parents provoked by this issue of control and discipline ultimately caused the removal of a principal at Crossover High. The feeling was that his style was responsible for a slip in the quality of education, which, as it turned out, was defined as a lack of discipline (particularly among white students). We will discuss the issue of principal style below.

Union demands. One final demand placed on those who run a school comes from the teachers' union. In New York City, for example, the union has had an effect on everything from class size to the length of the school day. And, like the parents in Memphis, the union has tried to affect the style of discipline used by the principal. But, unlike the principal at Crossover who the parents felt was too lax, the principal at Sheridan was criticized by the union for being too strict.

After several years of working for a principal with a relaxed style, a new principal arrived who considered discipline and control to be one of his top priorities. Not only students, but teachers were monitored far more closely than they had been under the old principal. This caused several members of the union at Sheridan to group together in opposition to the new procedures. Unlike the parents in Crossover, however, the union members had little affect and ultimately the most radical members of this group left the school. It should be noted, however, that as the principal has eased himself into the school he has received increased cooperation from the new union leadership and has relaxed some of his more stringent policies.

Coping Mechanisms: The Role of the Principal

It should be obvious, even to the uninitiated to school routines, that principals play a major role in the dynamics of schooling. As we have seen in the above discussion, the principal is often the recipient of a variety of demands from a variety of sources. To the students, parents, and teachers, principals are both a threat and a protection. They are empowered to make decisions that can almost destroy a student's or teacher's school career, while concomitantly serving as moral and behavioral guardians who are responsible for the inculcation of appropriate values and skills in children. As such the role of principals is a duplicitous one. While knowing that such order is not necessarily educational and/or responsible behavior, they are responsible for an orderly instructional and educational setting that has become the hallmark of quality education. Nevertheless, the principal's charge is to manage the career development of parents' children and teachers, and he or she is empowered both as an advocate and as a police officer.

Below we will discuss the ways in which a principal copes with the many demands of school boards, budgets, community groups, and teachers, both to educate and control the student population.

Bureaucratic tools. The role of the principal is so complex and may be played within a school that is itself so large that the principal is often forced, not only to play a part in the larger bureaucracy, but also to create a minibureaucracy of his or her own. This sometimes leads to almost ridiculous extremes. In Sheridan, for example where the number of demands on the principal are enormous and where 12 secretaries handle just the administrative paperwork, one system has been worked out

whereby teachers are forced to hand in semester grades one month before the term is over. While this helps with the record keeping, it causes problems for teachers. Aware that their grades no longer "count", students become even more difficult than usual to control. For two months a year, fully 20% of the time they are in school, teachers are unable to use one of their primary means of controlling students.

Principal style. The principal's style of operating and coping with the many demands placed on him or her is a critical factor in the morale and dynamics of what goes on in a school. As we mentioned above, principal style was a critical issue both in Crossover and Sheridan and, especially at the latter, had a direct effect on the dynamics of desegregation.

The first, black principal at the newly desegregated Crossover High knew that the primary concern among the community and the central administration was "to keep the lid on"--no matter what. The principal recognized this and further realized that one faction of the student body and one faction of the teacher was particularly influential within the community. The "honor students," as we call them, came from elite families, who, while being liberal enough to "try" desegregation, were not above using their influence. The "old guard" were the remains of the faculty that had served this elite class and were thus capable of mobilizing influence in the community, as well as within the school system, given their recognized reputation as the best teachers in the system.

Given the power of these factions and their allegiance to one another, the principal allowed them considerable influence within the school. The old guard received the better classes (populated by the honor students) and were the last to receive the additional teaching assignments that later became necessary. The honor students were allowed control of student government and student honors. Whenever possible both whites and blacks received "best dressed," "best student," etc. The selection of representatives for the student council was controlled by minimum grade and behavior requirements, teacher approval, and finally student elections--all of which gave the elite white students an advantage over the other students.

Maintaining this kind of (seemingly discriminatory) situation involved what has been termed a "negotiated order," one in which enforcement of rules was informal, but which the students and teachers alike perceived as legitimate.

But, ultimately, whites were led to challenge that "order" in an effort to dislodge a teacher who was unsympathetic (and perhaps unqualified), and in the ensuing struggle the principal was removed. His replacement did not comprehend the nature of either the negotiated order or of the struggle, so his style was quite different. He favored less negotiable and more impartial rules. Thus, the system favoring white students and old guard teachers was abolished, and punishment decisions were formalized; in consequence, the flight of white students was accelerated. Within the new student body, mostly black, many students refused to accept the strict rules as legitimate. An organized front of students has been challenging the authority of the principal. Furthermore, the senior teachers at Crossover (like their counterparts at Sheridan), were put off by the stricter rules, and many have retired or have requested transfers.

Such incidents reveal that, while the policy of the school system establishes a framework for desegregation, it is the principal who establishes the milieu of the school and so determines the interracial experiences of its students. The process of desegregation is fraught with emotion and with irrational anxieties (as well as rational hopes and fears). While the principal is subjected to legal and administrative directives, she (or he) has the responsibility to interpret these and has thereby the freedom to create, or influence greatly, the social climate for teachers and students. The latter, in turn, reflect their experiences to their parents and thus to the environing community, and so shape its response to the actions of the principal. For the latter, this is a great challenge: can she (or he) establish a secure setting for growth and productive learning, while mediating among the various factions of the community? So difficult is the situation, that it is all too easy to err, even with the best of intentions; with the immediate consequence at Crossover being, not only the exit of the white students from the school, but among the black students the breakdown in respect for authority and the inhibition of interest in curricular learning.

In terms of the analysis presented in chapter one (above), integration (in the sense defined by Pettigrew et al. 1978) did not develop in Crossover under either principal. Effectively, the first principal had two schools under one roof; the second principal had a black school--without the allegiance of the black community. Given the differing levels of education achievement of the incoming students of two social-races, the first principal was presented with a formidable task, calling for great creativity, if a productive interracial climate was to be achieved and integration to occur. The first principal did not rise to meet this task, but instead tried to cope with it by allowing a resegregation of white students and an appeasement of what he perceived to be the aspirations of themselves and their parents. In the long run, such a policy was doomed to failure.

Assumptions about Desegregation and Educational Attitudes

Crossover High has not been alone in its inability to truly integrate its student body. In fact, not one of the schools studied has completely met all of Pettigrew's criteria. Much of the discussion in this report of the findings of these studies will be an attempt to find out why this is so. The most logical place to start seems to be an inquiry into the assumptions of those who are responsible for inculcating students with the attitudes necessary for true integration to take place--the teachers and principals.

The colorblind perspective. Common sense and history tell us that there are fundamental differences among all of the ethnic and racial groups that make up American society. We think of the Irish as a group and conjure up one picture; we think of the Jews and conjure up another; blacks have a picture in their mind of whites as a group; and whites have one of blacks. Yet a common finding in the studies discussed in this report was an attempt to ignore these differences and instead adopt what Rist (1974) has called a "color-blind" view of interracial schooling. This perspective sees interracial schooling as an opportunity for

class assimilation. The purpose of schooling as seen from this perspective is to give all children a fair chance to learn the skills necessary for success in a basically middle class society.

Integration, then, is defined by those who adopt a colorblind perspective as cultural assimilation rather than cultural pluralism (cf. Wax & Wax 1971). All students, black and white, are expected to act in the appropriate middle-class, non-streetwise manner, and to learn standard, non-black English. This, however, can lead to a certain amount of resistance. At Crossover, for example, many students said they "dreaded" the English class. It was the one class period each day that had to be endured. It was where black students learned that their life style, their speech, their aspirations, and their interaction patterns were not legitimate (cf. Cazden, John, & Hymes, ed. 1972). At Crossover, race was discussed in the open. One black teacher was heard to remark to a black student "Why can't you be more like the white kids?" But this was not the case at most of the other schools studied. In general, the colorblind perspective led to the feeling that it is unfair or at least inappropriate to bring up race, since race is essentially irrelevant to one's needs and the opportunities that should be provided. Even taking note of race is seen as an indication of possible prejudice. Some researchers spoke of a "taboo" against mentioning race within the classroom. Schofield notes:

> When I was arranging the student interviews I mentioned to Mr. Little that I thought there was only one white girl in one of his classes. I asked if I was right about this and he said, "Well, just a minute. Let me check." After looking around through the class roster in his roll book he said, "You know, you're right. I never noticed that...I guess that's a good thing."

This perspective may be more common among white teachers than black. Because of the history of black-white relations in the United States, and for other reasons, whites are more vulnerable to having their acts interpreted as discriminatory against blacks than the reverse. The increasing visibility of black students, educators, and decision makers, and the recognition that whites are coming to constitute a minority in the schools studied, seems to be associated with a heightened anxiety among whites that their actions may be interpreted as motivated by race and racism.

The feeling, however, that "keeping the peace" and avoiding conflict was of utmost importance was universal among the teachers at the schools studied. Thus, norms developed to deemphasize the importance of race and instead place "blame" for problems somewhere else. In general, problems that in the past might have been attributed by whites to race are now attributed to social class. Student difficulties are attributed to problems that the students encounter at home--the poor conditions for doing homework, the disrupted environment, the necessity of dealing with a tough neighborhood. The recognition of student problems in these areas and the efforts of teachers to accommodate these problems is a position with which most of the teachers can sympathize. Unlike the potential of race, class or income level does not cleave the faculty in two. While it is acceptable to blame poor performance on social class, it is no longer acceptable to attribute it to race.

The refusal of most of the teachers studied to discuss or even acknowledge the importance of race and cultural differences in a desegregated school tends to leave the exchange of information about race, and especially about positive and close cross-color relationships, outside of consideration. This situation requires that students rely on racial benefits learned at home or from peers at school and on enculturation to bicultural competence as promoted by their peers.

Importance attached to desegregation. Most of the teachers interviewed appeared to appreciate the value of desegregation and the importance of giving students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds the opportunity to interact and get to know each other. Unfortunately, the colorblind perspective, when combined with traditional educational attitudes, limits their freedom to cope with this problem. Teachers lack training in dealing with interracial relations and yet are subjected to intense pressures to maintain security and order, lest violence erupt. Moreover, the emphasis on academics--as traditionally defined--justifies one or another form of tracking, so that, taken together, the teachers are led to act in such a way as to work against integration within the school, and, indeed, often to participate in a covert conspiracy toward resegregation, justified with the best of intentions.

Efforts to provide opportunities for interracial interaction and understanding. The colorblind perspective was intimately related to the feeling among many teachers (especially white) that even if they did nothing to promote interracial harmony, it would occur naturally. Hence, they see little need to set about structuring their classes in a way specifically designed to promote positive relations. A white math teacher at Wexler states this point of view clearly.

Interviewer: Do you think that the relations between black and white children will improve naturally as they spend more time together or do you think that specific things have to be done to push them together or to make them get along better?

Teacher: I don't know if you can do anything to make them (get together) ... I don't think that it's something you can force ... I think it will come in due time ... Nobody can be forced to go with ... if they are they will be negative ... So I think forcing them into a situation is not good. I think it has to be free and I've already seen some that the blacks and whites have gotten together ... they are doing things together on their own now. They didn't know each other in the beginning of the school year. So that was done very naturally ... There isn't going to be a race problem.

Similar attitudes were expressed at Pawnee, where teachers repeatedly stated that if students could be left alone, they would resolve the racial problems on their own.

But there was some encouragement, even if it was not conscious, when there was spontaneous interaction. For example, the investigators at Sheridan report that there is frequently a "learning underground" in

the classroom in which students share books, help each other with school problems and homework, and even exchange test answers. Although students will try to share information with those of similar racial or ethnic background, this is not always possible. Therefore, cooperation between races is forced on the students. Rather than interfere, the teachers ignore the underground and let it operate naturally.

Perhaps the greatest hindrance in providing real opportunities for increased racial interaction and understanding is the feeling among teachers that they are unprepared to handle the dynamics of discussing race related issues in an interracial situation. Yet the lack of knowledge about each other among students (and some teachers) can be staggering.

In one class at Grandin, for example, the teacher had assigned students to prepare reports on famous black people. They were to do the research at home and then give their report orally in class. On the day the reports were due, the teacher called on Henry to give his report on Martin Luther King. Henry, a white boy explained that he was not able to locate any information on Martin Luther King in the books his parents had at home, so he had prepared his report on Martin Luther, apparently figuring it was the next best thing to do. The teacher, who is black, was incredulous, demanding to know how Henry could have mistaken someone who lived in the 16th century for someone who was so famous, whom they had discussed, and who had been alive only ten years ago. Henry exhibited no sign of recognizing the enormity of his error.

Even so, there was very little effort in all of the schools studied to deal overtly with race-related issues in the classroom.

Differences in style between black and white teachers. The feeling among many teachers that they were incompetent to deal with issues of race may be due in part to a real lack of knowledge and understanding of the other group. This can be partially demonstrated by the difference in style between black and white teachers. For instance, at Crossover, the new black teachers generally held a different educational philosophy on curriculum matters than what had been standard for white teachers at Crossover. The black teachers wanted not only to impart academic skills to their students but also to extend assistance toward coping with their special problems. Because of their long association and identity with the Feeder neighborhood, the teachers were sensitive to the needs and "handicaps" with which these students arrived at school. The stated philosophy of the Feeder principal was, "Save a child," and with this in mind he used suspensions as a form of punishment, but expelled students only as a last resort. This philosophy was reflected in part by the teacher who said, "You spend hours trying to turn one kid around, but each night he has to go back to that same environment and try to survive. What they need is love. I try to give them love." Much time and effort were spent in trying to attend to basic needs such as finding clothing and jobs for children from needy families. Teachers from Feeder were familiar with families of many of the students and when a child got in trouble, instead of going through normal channels to contact the authorities, they would seek help from someone in the community. This attitude of trying to meet the needs of black children was not a case of favoritism, rather it was expected and accepted by black students, parents, and teachers.

The teachers who had been at Crossover did not have the same linkages to the black community nor the same understandings of the needs and expectations of the incoming black students. Creative leadership might have bridged that social gap and helped the teachers to establish productive roles with regard to these students. Moreover, it should be emphasized that, while the problem appears racial -- as a mismatch between white teachers and black students -- it is not: equally often, lowerclass white students have benefitted by the parental concern on the part of their teachers. In this case, however, the failure of the established teachers at Crossover to respond to the needs of the incoming black students led to a perception on both sides that the two parties could not work with each other, and so the withdrawal of the more "traditional" white teachers became inevitable. Likewise at Grandin, there developed among black teachers the opinion that white teachers lacked the understanding and training that was necessary for establishing productive relationships with the black students. Here, too, social-race was the superficial characteristic; the ultimate root of the problem was the lack of administrative leadership that would have helped the white teachers to enter into social networks with the parents and to respond to the different needs of the pupils.

Academic firsts and tracking. Although most teachers stated that they wanted desegregated schools, "academics" almost always took priority. The following excerpt from an interview with a white teacher at Wexler exemplifies this view.

> I really feel that the school is an academic setting. Quite frankly I think that's what its primary function is. I think it is good for the children to interact socially ... but I'm coming from an academic point of view. My emphasis is on academics. I believe a school should have an academic orientation.

The teachers' inclination to stress "academic work" very heavily is reinforced by numerous factors. Hence, those teachers who themselves are interested in adopting practices that lead to no more interracial interaction are constantly pressured to focus almost exclusively on traditional, strictly academic, materials. In addition, non-traditional classroom procedures such as cooperative work groups are often resisted because they are perceived as undermining academic progress for the sake of social goals.

In fact "academics" is a symbolic term standing for the organization of classroom activities that was tradition for these teachers. In the sense of formal learning, "academics" can retain a high priority within an integrated classroom, providing that the teacher re-conceptualizes the work so that recognition is given to the distinctive kind of cognitive development of each child, or of each distinctive group (cf. Wax and Wax 1971a; Wax and Wax 1971b)[7]. Despite the implications of the remarks of the Wexler teacher quoted above, the fact is that "academics" in some sense is high on the priority of the parents of almost all students in the desegregated classroom. But, the classroom has to be organized as a cooperative learning society in order that formal learning be allowed to emerge (cf. Dumont and Wax 1969; Dumont 1972), rather than being sabotaged by one or another of the parties (which agency of

sabotage can be a group of children of either social-race, or even the teacher).

At Wexler, and to some extent Grandin, many teachers have clung to the traditional program of the classroom, under the banner of "academics-first," and this has then justified the institution of informal tracking, despite the fact that it often leads to resegregation, which is expressly prohibited.

At Sheridan and Crossover, where tracking is permitted (and, in fact mandated at Crossover) the resegregation is so great that it can almost be said that two schools exist under one roof. At Crossover, the groups are neatly divided into black and white. At Sheridan, the higher level courses are multi-ethnic, although there is an over-representation of whites and Chinese, but the lower track is almost exclusively black and Hispanic.

Importance of security and order to control violence. Security and order are important problems for all schools, for without order and school safety instruction cannot go on. But, as we will see, the problems of security become such an overriding concern that they can come to interfere with the educational process.

The elements of the social organization that are most susceptible to control are the physical spaces available for certain activities and the time that can be allocated or participation in them. Space and time provide the means by which "safe" social environments can be constructed, maintained, and defended. Administrators, teachers, and supporting staff, particularly at the high schools discussed in this report, believe it important to control these dimensions of social experience in order to effectively manage student activities and restrict undesirable influences from entering the school walls. Emphasis has been placed on monitoring large gathering spaces (such as lunch rooms) so that the opportunities for major confrontations between groups of students are minimized. Most staff agree that little can be done effectively to eliminate the small-scale confrontations that occur at out-of-the-way places. The major technique for establishing and maintaining control of these internal spaces involves the control of time; the more students who are where they are "supposed to be" the fewer problems are likely to result. Therefore, school authorities enforce a rigid time schedule for students during the day.

Observations at Pawnee West yielded evidence[8] that time and space were important features of the social environment. As a result of the threat of violence that was part of the early phases of desegregation, the high school schedule was drastically changed: the school day was shortened by eliminating times--such as study halls and lunch hours --when large numbers of students could congregate in any one space, since these times offered greater opportunities for confrontations. Thus, there were severe cuts in the number of extracurricular activities that were held. A Parent Club member explained:

> Music program, some of the school dances, pep assembly ... things like this that they had to cut out for awhile ... because you know for awhile things were so [illegible] there the kids would be so unruly during the assemblies and pep assemblies and things that you couldn't hear the groups that were performing or anything you know

so they just completely cut out all of that. And now, the kids have asked you know to have this put back and things are going well. The kids are handling themselves beautifully and there is no problem.

Another tactic was the elimination of the lunch program. Students at Pawnee West attend homeroom and five straight classes with no break except the five minutes that are allowed for "passing." Without a doubt the long period between breakfast (if the student takes the time to eat) and lunch, when they return home sometime after one o'clock, is a physical strain. Teachers report that students in their fourth and fifth hour classes have more difficulty concentrating because of their hunger. In one of the student produced films at Pawnee, this state of affairs is depicted humorously by having instruction interrupted repeatedly by the growling of students' stomachs until finally all the students expire. In the final shot the camera pans across the bodies of the students slumped beneath cardboard tombstones affixed to their desks. One of the tombstones carries the message "Died for lack of concern."

The various class projects that sell "snacks" during the school day provide some relief for those students who can afford to purchase the bagels, doughnuts, or whatever else is vended. It is generally recognized that the nutritional value of this food is not high but from the perspective of the administrator the risks of providing a more substantial meal are too great. Serving lunch would yield the unstructured "student time" that would provide opportunities for disruption. In other words, it is in the students' best interests to be hungry.

There is a rhetoric of concern at Pawnee West that is used to justify several features of the social environment that are at issue around providing lunches for students. First, the concern for the safety of students necessitates the management of time as a device for controlling student use of space. The large congregations of students inside the building would provide too great an opportunity for violence and confrontations between student groups. Second, the present system corresponds with student preferences. Since all students could not be served at the same time, the school day would have to be extended to allow for an "extra period." Students do prefer to be finished with classes at one o'clock, although especially the younger students have some difficulty finding constructive things to do with their time after school. Third, the absence of lunch enables the building to operate more economically: serving meals would require additional supervisory staff. This staff would have to be either hired in at an additional financial cost or borrowed from other duties, thus forcing cutbacks in the range of student services currently provided. Comments about the poor nutritional quality of the food now available to students are dismissed since "the kids would eat that junk anyway." The possibility of stimulating increased student interest in school activities by having them in the building longer must be subordinated to the more pressing issue of controlling student time in order to provide for student safety. The educational advantage that students might gain from an additional hour of classes is dismissed because students who are interested in additional work may elect to take a sixth hour.

Parents accept the importance of control as a legitimate claim and acknowledge the responsibility of staff to regulate the use of space and time within the building. As one black parent noted:

> But this school's allright, though. They make the kids mind, they won't take any stuff. They sent this note home saying what all they'd do with the kids if they were caught doing anything. I know they don't stand for no fighting.

Controlling student time and space was also of critical concern at Sheridan. One means used there was the issuance of program cards that listed where a student should be at any particular time. Unlike Pawnee West, there is still a lunch period at Sheridan, but the program cards have helped to control students during the period.

The school has a rule that once a student goes into the cafeteria at the beginning of his (or her) lunch period, he (or she) must stay there for the duration of the period. This rule is intended to keep students from wandering about the halls and stairwells during class periods. They may only leave to go to the bathroom, in which case they must trade their program card for a pass and then return the pass in order to get back the all-important program card. To get in or out of the cafeteria, the student must display the program card. Because the card lists the student's schedule, the aide at the door, or any adult for that matter, can look and see if the student is legitimately supposed to be there during that period. To counter this control, some students have managed to obtain as many as six program cards and then filled them out with six different schedules so that they can justify their presence anywhere in the school at any period of the day. When asked how this was done, one student told the investigator that he got extra program cards by getting to know the teachers. He said that if you get to know teachers, they'll do things for you, but they usually expect you to do favors for them in return. When asked the kinds of things the teacher would expect in return, he thought for a moment and then said, "Well, you know, a little cooperation...like setting a good example for the rest of the class." He said that the way to get a program card is to get a teacher to like you and then just go up and tell him that you've lost your program card.

This kind of "negotiated order," in which administrators and teachers withhold enforcement of rules selectively so that the offender is indebted to them as was the style of the first principal at Crossover High. This can be contrasted to a "bureaucratic order," in which the enforcement of rules is more or less universal and impartial. This was the style of the second principal at Crossover. Bureaucratic order, as seen at Crossover, assumed the legitimacy of the principal's authority and the recognition of that legitimacy by all constituents. Thus, bureaucratic order, overall, enforced rules with impunity. Negotiated order did not take that legitimacy as given. Rather it was something that had to be developed and cultivated, even as rules had to be enforced.

The types of order were characterized by different enforcement strategies. Bureaucratic order was enforced by the principal himself. He administered discipline and he patrolled the halls. Further, the

bureaucratic principal developed an informal record keeping mechanism. He allowed students three "official visits" to his office, which he recorded on cards in a file in his office. By and large, these infractions were ones for which the formal administration of discipline would have been difficult, since evidence was lacking or not collected; thus, an "informal" disciplinary talk occurred. After three of these visits, the student became subject to suspension for an infraction for which evidence was present. Without three unofficial visits, a student with a similar offense generally would not be suspended.

The negotiable principal had enforced order via a network. He, the vice-principal, and the administrative assistant all were responsible for administering discipline. Usually, however, the negotiable principal would not make the discipline decision. The vice-principal and/or administrative assistant would do so, and would call in the principal only when extenuating circumstances were present. Conferences between the three were frequent, however, as discipline decisions were made. While the negotiable principal patrolled the halls, he put more emphasis on using teachers to enforce order. Further, the athletic coaches were given responsibility for maintaining order in the halls, a practice discontinued under the bureaucratic principal. The coaches under the negotiable principal were informal disciplinarians. They would "prompt" movement on to classes, the removal of hats, and elimination of jostling in the halls. Their approach, by and large, was to cajole students into compliance. Yet, only rarely would they in fact refer a student for formal discipline. In practice, they engaged in supervision but not in disciplinary behavior. Thus, the negotiable principal attempted to enforce rules informally through a wider network of teachers and coaches, as well as through the formal discipline meted out by the administration.

Under bureaucratic order, the student role is supposed to be passive and weak, but students do more questioning of the legitimacy of rules and the principal's right to enforce them. The increased severity of penalties (withdrawal from school) and relative lack of negotiability under bureaucratic order seems to have led to the emergence of an organized front challenging the school.

In short, under bureaucratic order the rules of the school became "his rules"--the rules of the principal. Their legitimacy was not established, and the students seem to have begun responding collectively. Defiance has resulted.

But defiance is not necessarily violent. In fact, although there was considerable fear in the cities and schools discussed in this report that desegregation would result in violence, there is little evidence that this has occurred. Whether or not it would have - had the controls not been as great - is difficult to say. But the controls have had their effects elsewhere. For example, at Sheridan the threat of physical violence is so great that more school resources and time have been allocated toward security and order. Thus, even in times of a budget crunch, security guards must be hired and teachers are forced from their normal duties in order to patrol the halls.

Limiting places where students can congregate has led to the development of turfs outside the school, and, at least at Sheridan, much of the physical violence that takes place is off school grounds. Fur-

thermore, because of a desire to be with friends, class-cutting is a serious problem at all of the high schools studied.

Finally, the fear of violence has led school officials to try to keep out "intruders." For example, one staff member at West explained the violence that followed a girl's basketball game this way.

> Well, the girl's basketball game was open. By that I mean anyone could attend the game and therefore outsiders were allowed in and I'm certain that the kids that were involved did not attend the school. They could've been students with a grudge against the school for one reason or another and when open events, such as the girl's basketball game, are held, the chance for disruption is always likely.

An "open" event allows penetration of the school walls by too many "troublemakers." On contrast, "closed" events are more likely to be a "success."

Interviewer: Why do you think the dance was such a success?
Respondent: Well, at the dance we didn't allow outsiders, the students who wanted to attend had to buy their tickets ahead of time and I'm sure that's why the dance was so successful. You heard about that basketball game the other night didn't you? Why I think that was kids who have a grudge against the school and also it was that the girl's basketball game--was an open game and that was definitely a mistake. You can see the comparison of the two, one was good and one was bad. The important thing is that outsiders were not allowed in. It's not the Pawnee kids who start these fights. I have noticed that the kids care. The kids care about what goes on here and they don't want fights or disrupters to interfere in their activities.

The problem is, however, that keeping out "intruders" also may mean keeping out the community.

Perceived quality of education since desegregation. One of the factors that can undermine the quality of education, particularly in desegregated schools, is the teachers' perception of the quality of education, that is, if teachers feel the quality of education will slip as a result of desegregation, it very well may. There may, in fact, be a self-fulfilling prophecy that results in a lowering of standards, thus creating a vicious cycle.

It is possible that this is occuring in all the schools discussed in this report. Inevitably, when teachers who were present before desegregation were asked about the quality of education at their school since then, they reply something like the teacher from Pawnee West who said:

> Although they work as hard as any kids ever, their ability has diminished. I require a lesser amount of work than I did ten years ago but what they do is no less well done. You know I've been

> reading their final research papers. There are a couple of really good ones but it has taken all semester. A few years ago, the students would have done two papers plus several book reports...I like my classes to be exciting, charged up. But I don't ask them to do as much. They don't have the background, the experience.

Of course, there is little chance that they will gain that experience unless given the opportunity. Yet the same thing is occurring at all the schools, particularly the high schools, studied. Standards are being lowered, even in the advanced, accelerated courses, and less is being asked of the students. Classes are less demanding; the material is more factual, less conceptual, and there is less homework. The climate of learning in the lower track classes has been reduced to one of merely marking time and cajoling students as to the correct deportment and character one should have to survive in the labor market. Teachers perceived their role in this situation as one of merely maintaining control. With this attitude, it is hard to imagine how the quality of education can improve.

Summary

Legislative rule or court fiat make school desegregation appear easy, as if all that is necessary is to cease the practice of segregation. But, as is shown by these ethnographic studies, educators must have great skill, knowledge, and confidence in order to create an integrated community within a school. Moreover, educators are constrained by budgets and pressured to accord higher priority to other aspects of school existence. Avoiding the negative is usually more important than achieving the positive. Thus, administrators are especially anxious lest students come into conflict with each other, for such events loom larger in the public eye than the achievement of interracial cooperation and friendships. They are also anxious lest they be denominated by any of a variety of terms in the lexicon of racial politics; and, of course, they must be anxious that they maintain a reputation for concern with academic achievement. Given the pressures of budgets and unions, and the overall drive for economy and efficiency, administrators tend to resolve these stresses by manipulating formal regulations and instituting bureaucratic structures. Space and time are organized and controlled so as to limit the freedom of the students (and the teachers) and to direct their attention toward safe topics. The curriculum is formalized and guided away from topics that might be provocative.

Within the bureaucratized world of the school, the issue of race is handled by taboo: the topic is not to be mentioned. Under these circumstances, no recognition can be given to the distinct cultural heritages of the different social-races, nor to differing styles of cognitive development, nor to differing dialectical or linguistic proficiencies. Given this taboo, teachers cannot be assisted in coping with the differences among their pupils nor in creating situations which bring the children into productive and egalitarian relationships with each other.

Given the differences in cultural backgrounds, the integration of curricular work becomes a challenge. Given the taboo, the challenge cannot be faced directly, so the simplest strategy is to allow resegregation by tracking. The result is to convert whites into "honor

students" and the minority children into inferior students, a process which leads to alienation among the latter while placing the former into an educational bind. Yet some form of resegregation continues to be the easiest strategy for most schools to follow, and, of course, the ultimate resegregation occurs either with white flight or with the opening of segregated private schools (as in the school districts of Crossover and Grandin and Sheridan).

V. STUDENTS

Although knowledge of the relationship of administrators and teachers to the community and an appreciation of their educational attitudes and assumptions about desegregation is important in understanding the dynamics of desegregated schools, it is meaningless without a thorough understanding of these schools' students: how they achieve status, perceive their education, relate to their teachers and rules of discipline, and perhaps most important, how they interact with each other.

Each of the schools studied was unique, and we cannot generalize the findings entirely. But there are many common threads that we will attempt to sew together to form a sampler of student life in desegregated schools.

Sources of Status

Extracurricular activities. Several sources of student status, including social class, race, and academic ability, are apparent in the schools studied; but, while relatively few students actually participate in them, extracurricular activities become the chief focus of a great deal of effort and manipulation by those students who do (Burnett, 1969; Coleman, 1959, 1961). These activities are an important source of reward and self-esteem in which the participants invest a considerable amount of time and effort. As Scrupski (1975, p. 165) reasons:

> That adolescent peer groups would exist without the institution of extracurricular activities is certain. However, it seems almost equally certain that these activities give added visibility to those who participate, indeed, allow a distinction to be made between those who do and do not participate and in that the activities tend to be ranked with respect to prestige, affect the sociometric standing of participants and nonparticipants.

Earlier in this report we discussed the theory that intergroup contact may reinforce previously held sterotypes and increase intergroup hostility unless the contact situation is structured in such a way that it provides strong institutional support for positive relations. There also must be cooperative interaction aimed toward the achievement of shared goals (Allport, 1954).

Although student commitment and, therefore, participation in extracurricular activities was very low in the schools studied (particularly the high schools), there was considerable effort among the authorities to encourage equal status and participation in school activities. This was true at Sheridan, for example, where the Student Organization Council always seems to have at least one black, one Hispanic, one Chinese, and one white member. Advisors there admitted that they try to get somebody from every group to participate in student elections.

At Wexler, a Student Council was set up for the very purpose of fostering better interracial relations and an increased group feeling and identification with the school. Although the teacher who organized the Student Council (Ms. Ireland) took a colorblind perspective and argued that group membership should not be a selection criterion, she

realized the importance of children "having fun together." And the Student Council did get many children, both black and white, involved in various campaigns to keep order and make the school a better place. For example, the Student Council members made posters urging good behavior, which they hung in the hallways and the cafeteria. Also, they set up a suggestion box committee to decide on the placement of such boxes. These boxes were useful because they let children who were worried or fearful about something bring it to the Student Council's attention anonymously.

In addition to helping children feel more secure, the Student Council also served a social function; it created a sense of belonging and group identity through an institution in which both black and white children participated. Thus, rather than leading to a situation full of the potential for conflict between opposing black and white groups, the Student Council induced the children to work harmoniously to achieve goals that they could not achieve without each other's assistance. This is obviously just the sort of contact that Allport (1954) argued is conducive to improved intergroup relations. In addition, the Student Council sponsored activities, like a talent show and a small newspaper, to which black and white students were able to contribute equally.

The success of the Student Council in fostering good relations between the students was apparent to other teachers in the school. Mr. James, the leader of another seventh grade team, refers to Ms. Ireland's success as he tries to characterize the way things went on his team in Wexler's second year as opposed to its first:

> Last year's students were Wexler's first seventh grade class. They (felt that because of this) they had something in common. This year (on our team) there is less of that feeling. Now whether they came into Wexler like that or were disillusioned (once they got here) I don't know. Building up a sense of group feelings (for them) would be a very important deed. Ms. Ireland and another teacher on her team did it. They set up this program. They were sending birthday cards to everybody on the team and...get well cards. They had dues... They planned talent shows and that kind of thing. That kind of thing builds loyalty to a group. It's like a team, almost like a group of athletes. Because the black and white (children) belong to the same group, it broke down some of the ... resistance.

However, it must be emphasized that, although the Student Council seemed to break down barriers markedly, it was not an overnight panacea for the fears and problems faced by students in getting along with one another. The relations between black and white students at the end of Wexler's second year are perhaps best characterized by the words of Sylvia, the black president of the Student Council who won her position after being nominated by a white friend.

Interviewer: Some people say that black and white kids in schools like Wexler get to know each other quickly and easily. Others say that this isn't the case. What do you think about this?

Sylvia: I think they get to know each other fairly quickly ... You know they don't want to be afraid. The only way they are not gonna be friends is if they think they are too good to be ... Most of the time, they'd be friends ... You might not know just everybody ... (but) you meet certain people who can be good friends.

In fact, extracurricular acitivities at most of the schools studied was an important source of interracial contact and friendship. At Sheridan, which was the most ethnically diverse school of those studied, some extra-curricular activities were culturally specialized, but most cut across ethnic boundaries. The Chinese, for example, predominate on the mathematics team, and, in some years, in art and photography work for student publications. Several of the sports teams appeal to particular groups. Blacks predominate in basketball and track; Hispanics in soccer and baseball; whites on the girls' swimming team. The girls' modern dance classes appeal equally to blacks and Hispanics. The Culture Clubs appeal overtly to ethnicity and serve to reify ethnic identity within the school. Other extracurricular activities, however, represent the most noticeable loci of recurrent interethnic interactions among Sheridan students. The Student Organization Executive Council, the Drama group, and the Peer Group Organization all usually have multiethnic membership. The informal associations in these activities operate with clearly defined rules of how to deal with ethnic boundaries. To some extent, the students who participate in these three organizations overlap. But they constitute a minority among Sheridan students both in the fact that they look to the extracurricular activities of the school for their friendships and in the multiethnic makeup of their interpersonal relations.

Investigators at Pawnee observed that those students who were most successful were also those who participated most in school life.

Class/Race/Sex and Extracurricular Activities

Social class and sex (gender) are of equal importance with social-race in the determination of status within the system of the school. The ethnographic studies of a generation ago (e.g. Havighurst 1962; Hollingshead 1949; and the related studies by Allison Davis, John Dollard, William Lloyd Warner and associates) demonstrated the influence of class and caste (social-race) in the status system of local schools. Since desegregation, the picture has become more intricate. On the one hand, there remains the hierarchy for males in which skill in athletics confers high prestige. But, here, there has been a resegregation in most schools, with sports such as basketball, football and baseball becoming black, while tennis, golf, and swimming are white. Within the status hierarchy derived from athletics, the prestigeful students are often black and lowerclass.[9] The order of status then devolves to white males, white females, and, last of all, black females.

At Crossover High School athletics had enjoyed high prestige, and at Feeder School this prestige was accompanied by strong and well-organized community support. When the schools were paired, the new combination of athletic talent produced outstanding football teams.

However, as white athletes found it harder to become prominent as stand-out players, "making the team" became less important to them, and white students simply withdrew, not only from participating, but even attending athletic events. The most intense area of competition among white students was for the elected offices of student council president and senior class president. Student government and student publications commanded high prestige and were dominated by upperclass whites, and the only blacks who could secure positions were middle-class in orientation--those willing to give up their street behavior and act "white." (A parallel situation existed at Sheridan.)

Although whites were in a minority at Crossover, they effectively outmaneuvered the blacks and maintained control of the important high status, elected offices and many key positions in school clubs. It was only in the 1977-78 school year that a black student was finally elected as student council president. There are at least two reasons for the previous control by the white minority. First, the old-guard white students were effectively organized. They know when to bring in certain black students in order to maintain legitimacy with the student body and school administration. Second, blacks as a group hurt their own positions in obtaining these offices by not voting for middle-class black students. This attitude may have, in part, been a deliberate sanction by the lower-class black leaders toward the upper group who they felt were either "acting too white" or who were in some way "copping out for a white thing." Black males who were capable and possessed the leadership skills were aware of this attitude, and hence were reluctant to put their names in nomination for the higher offices out of fear of being ridiculed. As one put it, "If I ran for president, what would the (other) dudes say?"

These patterns indicate one of the reasons why some black students prefer to attend all-black schools, for in that environment those who aspire to leadership have less reason to fear being hassled by the street-blacks on the grounds that they are acting too white. Moreover, in confronting white students who are organized into factions and who work as teams, the black students had not been able to develop competitive counterparts. Even in the athletic events, blacks seemed to be less interested in teamwork and more interested in being a "stand-out star," and this phenomenon was observed in both elementary and high schools. For whatever reasons, the more capable black students did not seek political office during the first four years of desegregation at Crossover.

Black girls were less sensitive to this peer pressure and did become candidates, but they had only been successful in taking over the secondary positions. Black males expressed their attitudes about girls in these offices by saying, "They only screw things up." However, the overall explanation can be attributed to the fact that most of the lower-class black males simply did not see any payoff and held little interest in these activities.

Yet these offices were important in controlling the life of the school, and the whites used them to maintain control over activities they considered important. For example, the president of the senior class always appointed the planning committee for the annual spring prom. This committee then selected the music group, which directly

influenced the style of music that would be played. Prom location also determined the accessibility by students. Thus, whether the prom would be accepted by either the white or the black students was guaranteed by the planning committee. Since black students were not interested in white music, they refused to attend or left the dance early.

Those middle-class blacks who wished to participate in such school activities as the prom, found it necessary to cooperate with the upper-class whites as a group. Encouragement by whites was based on their commitment to white group norms; clothing and hairstyles were moderate; standard English was used; and aspirations were shown for future achievement such as getting a college education. The black students who affected this conduct were included. Others who gained access to elected positions but were not willing to emulate these restrictions eventually became categorized as "deadwood" or "not caring." Moreover, students who did cross the boundary rarely gained access to decision-making.

Some middle-class black students had adjusted to these norms but were privately bitter about their high school experience. As one expressed it:

> After three years of this, I am just now learning how to deal with these tricky devils (white students). Even in petty things they will use trickery if need be to get their own way. The whites have taught me how to smile and at the same time be able to stick them in the back as they do me. I'm now able to play their game of smiling on the front and having no-good intentions in the back. I'm not bitter about desegregation, and I do not hate all white people. But it distresses me that they have to treat people like they do. Any time you get a white friend you just cannot trust them.

Student clubs that were sanctioned by the administration were similar to the student government in terms of participation. Where white students controlled, they promoted activities that minimized participation by the economically poorer blacks. For example, club activities such as overnight trips were too expensive for blacks; moreover, activities would deliberately be held at night, often in whites' homes, which most black students lacked the transportation necessary for attending. The black students perceived these schedulings as ploys to exclude themselves. At the same time, the whites were critical of the blacks for their lack of willingness to participate in projects or shoulder responsibility. Clearly, the contact situation did not provide equal status for its members and, therefore, engendered hostility as Allport (1954) suggested it would.

In sum, the white students from the upper segments continued to control student government and many club activities at Crossover, and hence, exercised inordinate amount of influence over most student activities for nearly five years even while they were a minority. Then, as they began to lose control of these activities, they started to leave the school in ever-increasing numbers.

Of the extracurricular activities at Crossover, ROTC was among the most integrated, but it also carried the greatest potential for inter-

racial violence. During a period of eighteen months, the only racial fist fights in the school occurred in the ROTC drill sections. Likely, this was associated with the fact that ROTC was predominantly a lower-class activity, and physical aggression was not only a cultural pattern among black and white lowerclass males, but was considered appropriate to the military model of masculinity.

Social class also seemed to be an important factor in the degree of participation at Sheridan. Ianni et al. explain this as follows: "The examination of the politics of ethnicity requires in turn an analysis of social class. The ethnic politician is often either an individual of higher class or upwardly mobile who appeals to lower class members of his or her group as a constituency. The student government in Sheridan replicates the patterns of citywide politics in this respect. This politicized process of ethnic identification must be distinguished from the more passive and unconsciously chosen identification that arises from common cultural patterns of speech, role expectations, beliefs and attitudes, and coresidence in an ethnically segregated ghetto. This second form of ethnic identification is likely to diminish with upward socioeconomic mobility which may be associated with assimilation to the institutions of the larger society and escape from the confines of the ghetto. The politicized form of ethnicity, however, may assume increasing importance at the same time that the cultural content of ethnicity and the economic segregation which creates the ghetto is diminishing. In New York, these two processes are strikingly evident...

"In general, individuals of higher class are less bound by the strictly cultural content of ethnicity, although they may or may not still attach great importance to co-ethnicity. Their general institutional competence is much higher and thus they find it not so difficult to engage in instrumental transactions with others who are similarly competent...

"The phenomenon of the high rate of interethnic interactions of the ethnic politician, who is likely to be middle-class, is a special case of the effect of social class on ethnicity. Here the very process of activist ethnic identification leads the social actor into a wider arena of associations.

"In general, ethnic boundaries are more rigid among lower class members of the ethnic category and among more recent immigrants... Higher class members of ethnic groups may still maintain their primary associations with co-ethnics, but they are thrown into more instrumental transaction with members of other groups since [not only extracurricular activities but also] the most prestigious classes at Sheridan are more mixed than the less prestigious classes, which tend to be predominantly lower class and non-white."

Academics. In addition to extracurricular activities and social class, academics is a source of status and, of course, a potential source of interracial contact. Not only Sheridan's, but Pawnee's, and to some extent, Crossover's college prep programs were biracial, in fact, far more so than the lower track classes. Students in these higher track classes were generally those most involved in school activities, and with the most frequent biracial contacts.

Most students in the high schools, however, are in the lower track, more-or-less segregated classes, and they rarely participate in extra-

curricular activities. For them, school is not an exciting or stimulating experience. They do not find either classrooms or the official school culture of clubs, athletics, and sponsored activities interesting, and do not participate in anything. As long as they do not cause disciplinary problems and do put forth a minimal academic effort to pass, they are left alone. One could say the official school system "avoids" them--and they, in turn, follow the same avoidance and noninvolvement strategies with the school--including classmates. Biracial contacts among these students is low. We will discuss the perceived effects of tracking, especially if one is in the low track, in the next section.

Perceived effects of tracking. A familiar argument about American schools is that they act as a set of conveyor belts, sorting students and supporting their passage to different stations in life (e.g., Leacock, 1969; Ogbu, 1974; Bowles and Gintis, 1976). This sorting function, it is argued, becomes visible quite early in a student's school career through tracking. Johnson (1976) reports in his ethnographic study of a Northern rural elementary school that the tracking of students into slow, average, and fast learner groups is clearly visible and recognized by the students by the time they are in the fourth grade. Rist (1973), in an ethnographic study of a St. Louis school, found that the initial sorting of students and subsequent training of them for their relative status in the ranked ability group was visible by the eighth day of kindergarten.

Clearly, this sorting has consequences for interracial relations. All of the schools studied used tracking to a certain degree and all were disproportionately white and middle-class at the top and black and lower-class at the bottom. As we mentioned above, those students at the top achieved more status and, in most cases, had more chances for positive interracial contact.

The positive effects of sorting a black child into a high track can be seen in the case of Mike Edwards, a middle-class black student at Sheridan who had been labeled as "intellectually gifted" early in his school career. As a result, he was put into special classes that were always more racially mixed than the regular classes. And, along with being in the college prep program, he was active in all facets of school life, particularly student government.

Perhaps Mike's success can be partially attributed to the confidence he built up as a result of being part of the "elite" for so many years. A variety of systems of tracking at Grandin provide an excellent opportunity to study the effects of tracking on self-image and image of others.

Over the past three years, Grandin has tried three different organizational styles with respect to ability grouping. In 1974-1975, there was a self-contained class for exceptionally talented children (ET). In the following year, the self-contained classes were abolished in favor of mainstreaming. That year teachers adopted a range of practices: within-class ability groups for the entire day, some grouping within the class according to ability for reading and math only, and "blocking" or combined between-class groups for reading and math. The third year, all the teachers practiced blocking for reading and math. This practice served to further mute the distinctiveness of the gifted and educa-

tionally mentally retarded (EMR) programs and the remedial math and reading program, since all students changed classes during those periods. Furthermore, the ET teacher had to include reading in the content of her course since the students in ET were not otherwise getting instruction in reading. Some of the students in that course considered it their reading class.

According to descriptions of the situation which existed when ET was self-contained, there were some antagonisms that developed between members of the ET class and other students at Grandin. The separation of the ET students from the others may well have fostered a sense of elitism. During the initial period of the research, two of the sixth grade students who had been in the self-contained ET class offered their services to the investigators as informants. They identified themselves as students of the ET teacher, even though they had a regular teacher with whom they spent most of the day. They also pointed out that they, unlike the other students, were "interested in learning about things."

In the 1975-1976 school year when mainstreaming went into effect, only one fifth grade teacher grouped students by ability throughout the day. In this class, the grouping appeared to coincide with the friendships that later developed among the students. Otherwise, the grouping for reading and the regrouping for math, the resourcing, and the blocking in sixth grade did not seem to have the same impact.

Students certainly have an awareness of the meaning attached to ET, EMR, the remedial classes, and the block classes, even though this is usually not reflected in the labels used to refer to these classes. Some students, for example, when asked about Mrs. Dane's students, indicated that an EMR student has what in Goffman's terms would be called a "spoiled identity." An EMR student was seen as lacking normal abilities to learn. Other students showed the investigators how to read the skill level coded onto the different reading books that were used in the block classes. Some students, wanting to get into one of the resource classes because they liked the teacher, asked the purpose of the class. When they learned it was for those who were a little behind in math, they lost interest. The meaning of the entire combination of classes, however, may be less clear than that of the past system with self-contained classes. The fragmentation promoted by the blocking approach, resourcing, and mainstreaming appears to have given students a more complex classification system with a more ambiguous meaning. One might be good in math but not so good in reading. In other words, the practices at Grandin during the last two years seem to have stimulated students to think of their abilities as differentiated according to subject. Such a classification system differs markedly from thinking of oneself as being in the high group or the low group.

In a situation in which white students are seen as academically superior and are separated into distinct groups, however, an understandable amount of tension develops. Rather than try harder, many black students give up and simply pass the time. Because of the high prestige associated with academic achievement and the white children's dominance in the academic arena, black children sometimes feel as if they are not fully a part of the school. For example, many of Wexler's students and faculty were very excited when their Middle School Quiz Team reached the televised final round of the all city competition.

However, one black girl refused to be quiet during the replay of the match on the closed circuit T.V. She muttered, clearly referring to the fact that the school's team was entirely white, "That's not Wexler School...might as well call it White School."

And, because they have been labeled as slow learners so early in life, the poorer students come to accept that role and lose interest in their studies as well. Carmen Nieves, a lower-class Puerto Rican student at Sheridan, is a case in point. When planning her curriculum for the next year, she simply let the guidance counselor place her wherever he pleased. As it turned out, these were primarily non-academic, "easy" courses.

The interviewer writes:

> They were trying to decide on what courses she should take next year. Mr. Hoffman (the guidance counselor) said, "How do you like nursing?" She said, "Oh, it's okay." He asked, "Would you like to take nursing again?" Carmen cocked her head to the left and shrugged. Mr. Hoffman said, "Okay, we'll put down nursing." Then he said, "Let's see, you've never had music. Do you like music?" She gestured the same way and said, "Yeah." He said, "Music is pretty easy. All you have to do is listen. Anybody can listen. All you have to do is listen and you pass music. How would you like music?" "Uh, okay," she answered, so she got music. In reference to nursing, she had told me earlier that she hated nursing and didn't want to take it any more, but when he asked her she just hunched her shoulders and said "Yeah."

Black students at Crossover seemed to be somewhat more conscious of their program decisions, but they still appeared to make them as the result of low self-image. They select courses that would place them in the least competition. They avoided classes where they might be embarrassed for not being able to read or spell. If a black student selected a course that was identified as white they were sanctioned by peers with a remark, "There ain't nothing but white faces in there." Nor would they wish to face a prejudiced teacher. Girls were particularly sure not to take a course where one of their close friends may not have been able to make it. However, the major reason was how the black students thought their education would pay off. Most placed a high value on a high school diploma. Commonly the need was expressed, "Every one else has a diploma; I have to have one," or "I can't get a job without a degree." Also black parents from Crossover saw a diploma as a great accomplishment in their lives. Many were from rural delta counties with minimal formal education. If they got their kids to school each day and saw a report card with passing grades they assumed they had achieved. Thus, the students, to "keep parents off their backs" took courses in which they had to exert minimal effort. Why stay in a standard English class and get a 'C' or 'D' when "You can pull an easy 'B' in basic English."

Moreover, even the most capable students were under a lot of anxiety about future prospects in the labor market. Keeping in mind that the Crossover community and Memphis as a whole was running about a 35% unemployment rate for adult black males, the kids were interested in maxi-

mizing their chances with obtaining salable skills of a vocational type. Many students simply did not see a payoff in courses not strictly applicable to employment. Stable employment with benefits and security was critical to them. For example, one student stated she "would go to college if she couldn't get in the Post Office."

Thus, we see that years of tracking and separate curricula, when combined with a dim outlook on life associated with poverty, have resulted in low self-images among many black students. This has caused them either to take the easy way out and simply try to get by in order to get their degrees or simply to lose interest altogether in their school and their studies.

In the next section, we will observe how the withdrawal of interest of black students from school compounds the problems that educators must resolve in the operation of a desegregated school.

Relations with Teachers and Administrators

Negotiations for time in the classroom. Students and teachers are in a constant battle for control of time (Dumont and Wax 1969). These negotiatins for time usually occur in the classroom. The entire time period allocated to teachers is seldom spent on instruction; the proportion of that period when teaching occurs depends upon the outcome of the negotiations between the teachers and the students. Students try to restrict the official time in the classroom by many strategies: talking, opening and closing their books, being restless.

There are a variety of these behaviors by which students indicate their lack of acceptance of the demands for their attention. For example, students can negotiate more time for themselves by delaying the actual start of teaching in class and by signaling the end of class by packing up their books when they have had enough. Teachers must constantly protect teaching time from student incursions.

More subtle techniques are apparent during the actual time of instruction. Students can resist official teaching time constraints by "tuning out" the teacher, by withdrawing from the classroom activities, by coming to the class unprepared with papers, books, or other materials, or by causing disturbances. Classroom etiquette seems to imply that a teacher should not bother a student who has put his or her head down on the desk either to sleep or retire because of not feeling well. When reprimanded for sleeping in class, one student was offended, saying, "You know, I wasn't bothering anybody."

This minimal participation and withdrawal from class can start as early as elementary school. One boy at Grandin, for example, was never observed to initiate an interaction wth anyone. He did as he was told, but remained completely passive despite the teacher's efforts to engage him. The teacher later told one of the researchers that she had seen Jake on the street one day with his brother and that she could scarcely believe his animation and activity. By drawing little attention to themselves and minimizing their response when called upon, students can withdraw from the class. One fifth grade student had been so passive that no one had noticed she could scarcely read.

One arena in which teachers and student have complex negotiations, especially at the high school level, concerns homework. There is a

long-standing debate over the value of homework, since students resist the infringement on the after-school time. Most teachers resolve the situation by allowing students to begin the homework in class, and those who work quickly, usually finish. The major difficulty with homework is the impossibility of making sure it is finished; although it can affect grades, students have so may ways to defend not working during "student time" that most teachers make sure there is "official time" provided. One teacher at Pawnee stated:

> that there weren't any philosophical differences between teaching in junior and senior high school. "Teaching is teaching." When asked about homework, however, she allowed that might be one area of difference--in junior high school most assigned work that can be done in class whereas in senior high school work is taken home. (She pointed out that she had taught at both levels and so had had some experience both places.) She reports real difficulty in the area of homework. She assigned 20 problems, 10 of which were completed by a student by the end of the class period. She told this student to complete the assignment at home. The student told her "I don't work at home." She told him that he was supposed to.... You know what happened, of course?" The next day he comes to class without his book and the 10 problems which he had done the day before. I try to tell the kids that they should get all their things ready to go in one place. That's a "life skill." But they don't listen. It's hard enough to get them to bring paper and pencils. Now I finally have got them all to have pencils-I have to give them paper by State Law. They just don't think those things are important."

Therefore, we see teachers and students involved in a complex, never-ending negotiation process over control of official teaching time in the classroom. The indication from these studies is that students are able through these techniques to effectively limit the constraints of teaching time and to accumulate more student time in their day.

Skipping. A serious problem in almost all American schools is attendance. In fact, frequent cutting was a source of irritation at all of the schools studied. At Grandin, for example, the average number of absences for the students observed was 11.8 days and 11.0 days for their fifth and sixth grade years, respectively. Some students had more than 50 absences. By staying away, students avoid problems with their teachers and problems with their peers.

Students at both Pawnee and Sheridan report that the important thing is to know when to "cut" or "skip." The essential element in this knowledge is not missing important deadlines or examinations that would put the student in serious jeopardy of "failing the course." Skippers will make it a point to see the teachers or other students in the parking lots to find out when tests are being given and to attend class that day. Students selectively cut some classes and attend others, partly in response to how rigid the teacher is in enforcing absences, whether or not they can obtain a legitimate excuse, or whether or not the consequences appear to be severe. At Sheridan, students often get themselves counted absent for the day if they want to cut some classes

and go to others, because cutting is a more serious infraction than an absence, which can easily be justified with a note, often forged.

Students give many reasons for skipping: boredom, defiance, dislike of a particular teacher or class. One white student at Pawnee explained what student do when they skip and why they avoid classes:

Respondent: Some kids--like they might come first hour, second hour and leave. Some might come first, second, skip third ad go to fourth and fifth. Most of the kids just leave here all day. Go up to X Junior High come back here and catch the bus. If you get caught you get kicked out.
Interviewer: Why do you think the kids skip?
Respondent: Boring, classes boring. Some not passing, not trying, just passing. Some want to get away for the day.

Much of the high rate of class cutting is attributable to the fact that students are often not able to see their best friends because their programs diverge. One of the great curiosities of the high schools studied is the fact that students will come to school day after day and yet miss their classes. Instead they congregate on the periphery of the school, in stairs, hallways, the cafeteria, and even in the administrative offices under the very noses of adult staff. They don't like classes, but they love school for the opportunity it gives them to congregate with their age peers. As we mentioned earlier, only a small percentage of them manage to structure their informal associations within the extracurricular activities that the school provides and legitimates, such as the student clubs, teams, and activities. Therefore, most students must make clandestine appropriations of whatever unsupervised space and time they can find.

Cultural differences between students and teachers. It is interesting to note that in almost all the schools studied blacks are suspended and expelled proportionately more often than whites. Of all students suspended at Wexler, for example, 80 percent are black.

In and of itself this fact may not be proof of racial discrimination, but it does suggest that school disciplinary policies and practices should be examined. That examination might uncover rules which are not essential but which are needlessly at variance with the norms of certain groups. For example, Forehand and Ragosta (1976) tell of a conflict in a high school over a dress code which prohibited hats indoors. Black male students argued that this prohibition was essentially arbitrary and discriminated against them by outlawing a practice common in their culture.

Even at Grandin, at least one teacher was mentioned as an example of someone who, instead of accepting change, clings to old standards of dress and deportment and attempts to enforce them. The teacher tries to prevent the students from using certain kinds of language, wearing hats and unbuttoned shirts; overall, she expects students to accept her as an unquestioned authority. This teacher--and a few others--were singled out by a colleague as persons who lack the understanding and knowledge that would enable them to effectively teach the type of students now attending Grandin. Such teachers, it was argued, have not mastered the styles in interaction and discipline that would now succeed with

Grandin's students. The same charge can probably be laid against many of the older, more traditional teachers at the other schools studied; while many of these teachers are white, it is their set of norms, not their race, that is troublesome.

Interracial Relations

Perhaps, one of the reasons underlying the court decisions mandating desegregation is the feeling that the only way blacks and whites will get a chance to learn about each other is if they share common ground and experiences. As we have mentioned throughout this report, many circumstances mitigate against the development of interracial friendships and cooperation. For example, tracking often results in a resegregation of the schools. But, as we have also pointed out, much student time is spent outside the classroom. Therefore, the question remains, do students interact when they are given the freedom to do so? Evidence from these studies indicates that the answer is no. Although a small number of the "better" students do interact outside of the classroom in extracurricular activities, the majority tend to stick to members of their own group. This can be seen most clearly in the development of racially segregated turfs, which were obvious at almost all of the schools studied.

Turfs. One of the most natural places for interracial interaction to occur, if it were to occur anywhere outside the classroom, would be in the lunchroom. Yet, there was little interaction at the schools studied. (Pawnee, of course, did not even have a lunch program because of the fear that interracial interaction in such an open setting could result in violence.) Schofield, for example, made a detailed analysis of seating patterns in the lunchroom at Wexler and found considerable racial isolation and little change over the course of the two-year study. There was also a considerable amount of ethnic grouping in the lunchroom at Sheridan, and, in fact, whites rarely entered the lunchroom at all.

Such segregation occurred not only inside but outside the schools as well. One unique characteristic of the peripheral area of most high schools is the mobility it provides for students to congregate in ways that they themselves choose. In an urban area, the immediate surroundings of a school can often harbor a fair amount of activity even when schools are closed. Student activities consequently become one part of a number of general transactions--such as shopping, buying food, or using public transportation--which occur in the area. The periphery can also provide protection for young people who might otherwise be brought to the attention of law enforcement officials or irate community residents. Amidst the hustle and bustle of urban life, a reasonable attitude for a passerby or local resident to have is that the school administration and staff have a responsibility that extends to a nebulous point somewhere outside the walls of the building; student activity, even if somewhat offensive and distasteful to others, can be designated as "the school's problem."

Youth are given an opportunity to sort themselves into groups on the periphery of the school with a minimal amount of outside interference from adults. And when they sort themselves, they tend to do so

primarily on the basis of physical characteristics. This finding was fairly obvious after only one day of observation at Sheridan. The investigator writes:

> My general impression was that most students can be found outside of Sheridan along an L-shaped line that goes from the corner of Water and Second down to First and Broad. For the most part, the students on the handball courts appeared to be of Hispanic origin. Youths in the pizzeria were mostly black and white. The youths inside and front of the dairy restaurant appeared to be Oriental. There were numerous groups which were mixed on Second between Broad and Water and students on the corner of Second and Water proceeding down Water Street were mostly black.

Such racial segregation, although it was not studied in depth, was also seen outside Pawnee.

Fieldwork at Sheridan indicates that activities outside the school are circumscribed by the elements of structure and process related to the formal organization of the school itself. Many students hanging outside Sheridan appear to have chosen their times and places according to their class schedules. For example, numerous students come outside only during lunch or study period and/or before or after they attend all of their classes. Such students can be limited in their selection of acquaintances to those persons who have similar schedules to their own. In such instances, their friendships are subject to the temporal boundaries imposed by the school.

There are elements of social structure outside Sheridan, on the other hand, which seem to affect the formal organization of the school. For example, two very close friends with different lunch periods might choose to cut one class apiece so that they can eat lunch together. Several students have used this strategy after the failure of their attempts to alter their schedules so that they could have the same lunch period. Social relationships also seem to affect class attendance, particularly during the first and last periods. Numerous students have been observed to cut a class upon encountering a friend hanging around outside, even though the former student might have initially intended to attend class. Although it was not studied in depth, this is probably occurring at Pawnee, and perhaps Crossover, as well.

Differences in levels of aggression between blacks and whites. Although there was considerably less violence than one might have expected within newly desegregated schools, aggressive acts were recorded at all of them. Interesting, however, is the finding that the level and kind of aggressions differs for blacks and whites.

This difference appears as early as the fifth grade. It was apparent at Grandin, for example, that white students had a way of verbally arguing with which blacks were unaccustomed. Whereas other whites would often see the initiation of the argument as a signal to argue back verbally, black students usually saw it as a signal to fight back physically. This reaction on the part of the blacks, in return, was not always understood by whites and could be interpreted as a sort of generalized hostility. The total lack of knowledge in how to handle these challenges is evident in watching responses of some of the white girls. Avoidance is one method; total non-response another.

But failure to fight back in the eyes of other blacks is sometimes seen as a sign of weakness, and thus encourages more intimidation on the part of blacks. On the other hand, whites, especially girls, are sometimes frightened by the "physical orientation" of some of the black students. Thus, if a black boy inadvertently brushed his arm against a white girl, she might think he was trying to provoke a confrontation.

This tendency for blacks to express themselves physically appears to carry on to middle school. At Wexler, black boys were observed hitting or punching each other nine times as often as white boys and boxing with each other twice as often as white boys. Black males initiated the hitting in interracial interaction just over nine times as often as whites.

At Grandin the differential behavior patterns of blacks and whites appear to have had strong impact on the development of social relations between black and white students. Although black and white children generally agree about the amount of fighting and intimidation that occurs, the white children, especially the white males, are more frequently afraid than the black children. Children of both races were interviewed, and both agreed overwhelmingly that whites are most frequently the object of whatever intimidation occurs in the school. Thus, the white children's fear is understandable. Like the white children at Grandin, those at Wexler are much more likely than blacks to let themselves be taken advantage of. Often they yield when just a little resistance could resolve the encounter and so would establish a very different precedent for the future. The more aggressive children, both black and white, recognize an easy target when they see one.

Interviewer: Are there certain kids who are more likely to get picked on than others?

Barb (white): I think the kids that are scared to stand up to people get picked on. My friend (is an example). She's scared of people just walking past her that look strange to her... She's scared of mostly everything I could name.

Interviewer: And because she's scared all the time, kids are more likely to pick on her?

Barb: Right!

The white children seem to be more afraid than the black children, not only because they are in reality more often the recipients of threats or of aggressive behavior, but because, like the white girls at Grandin, they tend to interpret many ambiguous or even playful acts as attacks. One teacher told of a situation in which a white child experienced physical contact in the hall as intimidation even though it probably was not intended as such.

> (She) went on to say that within the last month one concerned white mother called her up to talk about the school. The mother said, "My son says that a good day at Wexler is a day when there is no intimidation!" The mother was shocked by the statement and very upset by it. She had asked the child what sort of intimidation was encountered and the child said "mainly pushing and shoving and sometimes hitting out in the halls." The child also said that

> black children were almost always the initiators of such intimidation...The mother herself said that from the child's description of the incidents, she was unable to tell whether they were really meant as intimidation or not. (The teacher, who spends much of her day in the hallways) said that she felt that much of the pushing or hitting was not meant as intimidation, but that the child just wanted the other person out of his way and would barge through without meaning to scare anyone...I myself was once almost literally knocked over by a rather large black child who was pursuing another black male up the ramp. I'm sure the child gave no thought to the fact that he bumped into me. He was intensely occupied with catching up with his companion. However, the bump rather hurt. If one were anxious or fearful of intimidation one might easily have interpreted my experience as an instance of it.

Like the children at Grandin, the white children at Wexler seemed to adopt one of three major strategies in dealing with the threat they perceived from black children. One strategy used by many children is submission. They fail to protect themselves or to call on others to do so. Another strategy, more common than submission, is a rather passive withdrawal from the situation. These children do not object; they do not overtly refuse to do what is requested, they withdraw discreetly. A final strategy is simply to ignore behavior by blacks which they find annoying; they act as if nothing at all happened.

These strategies of submitting, withdrawing, and ignoring all appear on one level to be "safe" strategies for handling a threat because they minimize the chance of overt confrontations. But adopting these strategies, especially the strategy of submitting, appears to encourage dominant behavior on the part of the more active children. The child who routinely submits, even when the threat is minimal, only reinforces the dominant behavior of the other children who then can get what they want with little or no effort. The strategy of ignoring, in addition to encouraging the more dominant children to do whatever they wish, may actually provoke more intense efforts to annoy in order to gain at least some recognition of their existence.

This remains true even in high school. When asked why whites were more likely than blacks to be provoked, one Pawnee student responded:

Respondent:	I don't know. Like if a black hits another black they know they will hit back but if they hit a white they just keep on going...
Interviewer:	So if a black pushes another black person they are liable to get hit?
Respondent:	Ya.
Interviewer:	Is that how it seems?
Respondent:	Ya.
Interviewer:	Why do you think white people let it go?
Respondent:	I don't know. (The blacks) ought to get smacked if they push...(the) whites look like they are mad but I don't know...

One interesting observation was the fact that those white students most comfortable with blacks and least afraid would not submit to aggressive acts by blacks.

It should be added that the difference between blacks and whites in aggressive behavior and in response to it may be attributed as much to class differences as to anything else. Recall that at Crossover, the only violent confrontations between blacks and whites occurred among the primarily working- and lower-class members of ROTC. As we discussed earlier, there were distinct class differences between black and whites at Grandin, Wexler, and Pawnee.

Other cultural differences. Whether it be a result of their social class or their race, the differences in the way blacks and whites interact is apparent. And these differences become visible at an early age. White girls at Grandin, for example, find it acceptable to act weak and vulnerable; blacks, on the other hand, see this as a sign of immaturity and feel that it is important to stand up for oneself. There are differences as well in the way blacks and whites dress and speak.

These cultural differences inevitably lead to difficulties in forming close informal relations between black and white students. Perhaps this derives in part from the limited contact they have outside of school. Residential segregation means that students are unlikely to encounter one another in their neighborhood or in places like church. And, as was observed in New York, a student's best friend is usually someone known from the neighborhood. Those few students from multiethnic neighborhoods seem to be the ones with multiethnic friendships inside the school. The majority, however, have predominantly intraethnic relationships inside the school.

Of course, as we mentioned earlier, a student's social class does have some bearing on whether or not he or she will form interethnic friendships. For the most part, upward social mobility is usually associated with decreased ethnic identification, and, therefore, greater likelihood of interethnic friendship. This seems to be true at most of the schools studied. Middle class students tend to participate more in school life in general, and, therefore, have more opportunity to develop interracial relations.

It is interesting to note that when there is a common interest, it will act across ethnic and racial boundaries and unite students. The student council at Wexler is one example. A far more interesting one is that drug use seemed to be interethnic at both Sheridan and Pawnee. At Pawnee, for example, the only interracial group seen congregating outside the school was smoking marijuana.

Polite cooperation and avoidance. If there is so little in common ground, and thus so little positive interracial interaction, why is there not more animosity and violence between black and whites? Part of the explanation seems to lie in the fact that, in the same way whites simply ignore aggressive acts from blacks, so most of the individuals in the schools studied, black and white, teachers and students, politely cooperate and avoid any situation that could provoke a confrontation.

The informal expectation is that at a minimum, standards of politeness will be maintained in black-white interactions. This set of norms might be thought of as promoting, at the least, an air of "polite cooperation." In teacher-teacher interactions or in student-student

interactions, there is an expectation of courteous and polite treatment commensurate with what might be expected among acquaintances of equal status.

The politeness demanded in cross-color interactions does not necessarily entail friendship. One of the white teachers at Grandin called attention to the superficiality of the sociability among black and white teachers by suggesting that it would probably not carry over into neighborly exchanges should a black and white teacher live in the same area. A black teacher pointed out that although everyone is polite, the friendliness goes only so far. When the teachers choose cars to ride to a mutual destination, whites ride with whites and blacks with blacks. And, as we have discussed, there was little interaction and friendship among students as well.

At Pawnee there seemed to be implicit rules for avoiding interaction -- and, therefore, possible confrontation -- with members of another race. The understood rules for behavior are: mind your own business and avoid risks. One black female student explained it as follows:

> (I) am...cautious and make sure I don't get into any trouble. I mind my own business, my mother always told me just mind your own business and you won't get in no trouble.

Another black female who was active and visible in student life at Pawnee was seriously beaten by her former black boyfriend for associating with a white male. Although incidents such as this are unusual and dramatic, they do illustrate the risks that are involved for students who defy the accepted understandings that govern student life at desegregated schools.

One event at Pawnee threw the operation of avoidance and polite cooperation mechanisms among students into sharp relief. The event was the first Homecoming Dance to be held in several years. The pattern of student behavior was such that they alternately used the same space but almost never interacted.

> It was long after students began to arrive that a very clear pattern of segregation manifested itself. The side of the room on which I was sitting was white. The side of the room opposite that was black. The tables on the side of the room where I was were largely occupied by white students. Males and females clustered around those tables. Toward the front of the room it was all students toward the band. Then farther away from the band were some faculty and some black faculty and parents. Conversely, on the other side of the room was largely black. Twenty tables on the opposite side of the room, only three had any whites at them. One of those three was a table of chaperones who were white. One was a table of all white students and at one table there were both blacks and whites. However, in only three out of twenty of the tables were any whites. Whites to the extent that they danced, danced to the white music--the white band; blacks to the extent they danced, danced to the black band. At one point, later in the evening, a black student was walking across the floor of the field house right

after the big band stopped playing and before the black small group bagan and hollered out "Maybe now we can have some music we can dance to." I was struck by the symbolic quality of the bands. The white band seemed to be from a different era; an era much more comfortable to the faculty. The black band although much more clearly of a black identification was much more into their own kind of music and not primarily geared to satisfying the audience for that dance. Consequently, there was very little dancing. I believe one of the big band numbers was a rather slow tune late in the evening about 11:30 or 11:45 P.M. where a good number of faculty and several white couples danced too. Also much later in the evening there was some dancing when the black grouped played. However, at no point was the dance floor in any way full.

The pattern was clearly defined with blacks at one side of the fieldhouse, dancing occasionally and exclusively to the "black band" and whites at the other side dancing to the "white band." One black male ninth grader was observed standing at the door to the "white side" of the fieldhouse, hesitating over his decision where to sit. He stood a few moments looking things over, shrugged and made his way to the "black side" of the gym. The message seems to have become clear to him--each group has its well-established space. The vast expanse of fieldhouse floor reserved but not much used for dancing seemed small in comparison to the social structural gap that separates the races in Pawnee.

Ethnic labeling

The kind of polite cooperation and avoidance exhibited at Pawnee and Grandin went so far as to affect the language students and teachers used to refer to each other. At most of the schools studied there was a refusal to refer at all to race. The norm against making direct reference to the fact that blacks and whites exist as relatively distinct social groups was so strong at Wexler, for example, that Schofield has labeled it a "taboo." This infrequency of direct references to race was noted also at Pawnee and Grandin.

In general, this has been explained as one more way to reduce the risk of inadvertently offending a member of the opposite race and precipitating unexpected and undesired confrontations. This can be substantiated, in part, by the observation that students tend to break the taboo against making racial references primarily in interaction with students of their own group. Furthermore, at least at Wexler, black children are more likely to make racial references than white children. According to Schofield, white students tend to be very leary of mentioning race because they are afraid black students will respond negatively. Again, as with physical confrontation, the white students seem to be more afraid of blacks than the blacks are of whites.

It must be added that at Sheridan there was little hesitation to use racial and ethnic labeling. This may be partially explained by the sheer diversity of the student population. Using ethnic labels simply aids in avoiding confusion. But it is interesting to note that there is a general tendency for speakers to identify someone more specifically, the more elements of common identity they share. Thus, a student born in New York City of parents born in Puerto Rico calls another student

recently migrated from the rural areas of Puerto Rico by the term "Puerto Rican hick." A third student, however, of non-Hispanic background altogether calls both of the first two "Puerto Ricans" indiscriminately. If white, he may even refer to them as black although Hispanics refer only to American Negroes as black.

Similarly, students who are phenotypically "Chinese" may make linguistic distinctions of each other in terms of what part of China they or their families originated from and, especially, according to whether or not they speak the Chinese language. Non-Chinese students, however, lump all these subcategories as "Chinese." Thus, members of each ethnic group had more ways of referring to other members of the same ethnic group than they did to refer to members of other ethnic groups.

Even at Grandin, where derogatory use of cross-color references were rare, the blacks had an extensive list of labels they could use when referring to themselves. Black students there frequently attempt to exhort behavior through the use of racial terms to tease or taunt each other. One light-skinned girl, in particular, is the object of considerable teasing. For example, one day this girl, Helga, and two other girls were sitting together at lunch, when an ant crawled across the table.

> Jan accuses Helga of bringing the ant in her lunchbox. Helga denies the allegation. Then Jan, pretending to speak for the ant says, "Let me go to a white girl's lunch--so it picked Helga." Helga does not respond. Gwen, the other girl, picks up the tease, "Then the ant said, "No, I want a black girl's lunch to eat--so it went to Helga." Helga makes no comment. She looks straight ahead and ignores their laughter.

Another common form of in-group teasing used by black students is name-calling which incorporates racial terminology. One day at lunch the following exchange occurred.

> One black boy was trying to attract another's attention. The boy yelled out, "Hey, red man." The target of this address (a boy frequently called this name because of the reddish color of his hair) immediately turned around smiling, and yelled back, "Go on, you blacktar nigger."

Appelations such as "black gargoyle," "blackie," "black biscuit," and "nappy head" are other examples.

These words as well as others, especially the word "nigger," are often used as address forms by blacks. When used as a form of address as in "come here, nigger," black usage of these terms may have positive connotations, being nearly equivalent to "friend" or "brother." Although use of "nigger" in this way is common among blacks, only one or two white students were allowed to use these words when addressing blacks.

There were few instances of whites singling out others on the basis of group identity or physical typing except in an explanatory context where they might use the group label "white." There were no examples of whites exhorting each other or addressing each other using racial ter-

minology. Perhaps this is because the only element of common identity they share is color. In a society where blacks are a minority group and labeled as such, they begin to share many common identities, and thus more specific labels.

The development of friendship: The effects of self-sorting and stigma. Many factors, including segregated neighborhoods, cultural differences, linguistic labels, tracking, and fear mitigate against the development of interracial friendships. Whatever the reason, most students tend to sort themselves into groups whose members have the same background.

The stigma attached to those few who venture out and seek friendships among members of other groups is often so strong that many are discouraged at the outset. The reader will recall, for example, our discussion of the reluctance of middle class blacks at Crossover to run for election to student government for fear they would be outcasts among members of their own group and, the fact that they often became such if they took part in "white" activities. Similarly, students at Pawnee suffered severe sanctions if they "crossed over" and acted as if they were members of a different race.

Many informants reported the difficulties involved for students who have friends or make dates with members of another race. A graphic example of this phenomenon appeared as part of a student produced film which addressed the experience of integrated education in Pawnee high schools. In this scene a black cheerleader is shown talking with four or five white cheerleaders. She is "discovered" by a group of black students who ridicule her for "wanting to be like them." Reluctantly the black cheerleader turns her back on her fellow black students and returns to her discussion with the white students. The message is clear. This black girl has been forced to choose, and either choice has its costs. The film's producers see this as an unfortunate consequence of "integrated education" that they hope students will eventually outgrow.

The question is, will they and at what point? Clearly, those students--such as Sheridan's Mike Edwards--who are from integrated neighborhoods, and have been attending integrated schools from an early age, have a better chance at establishing successful interracial relations. But, although he has friends of other ethnic groups, Mike's best friend is black. Even so, it appears that the students who do the best, are the ones who are most integrated in school life, and these are the ones who have most in common with the white "elite." The fact that Mike is from a middle-class background has certainly helped him achieve the success that he has, but his history of shared school experiences with children of varied ethnic backgrounds has given him another shared identity that no doubt has contributed to his success.

Summary

Whether white or black, male or female, when children are transported into a strange environment, away from their family and their neighborhood associates, the reponse is uncertainty and fear. When the school is far, and the population of students a mixture of ethnic and racial novelties, and there is a reputation for violence, then children may become extremely anxious. The presence of friends or family can (or

could) help considerably in reducing these fears to manageable size. In the schools studied, there was a process of learning and coping among the students (however, the teams did not seek out the children who had moved or transferred after initial enrollment). Students constructed cliques of friends who could be relied on for assistance, and they learned the areas of the school which were hazardous and required either avoidance or circumspect tactics. In their earliest encounters with the school, fear was so pervasive among many students that interracial contact would have been impossible. Over time, there was a decrease in fear of those from different backgrounds. And, those who participated in school activities seemed to have the most positive (and reassuring) experiences.

Perhaps the most transient phenomena--yet having the most serious implications--are the casual encounters between the races in such poorly controlled areas as hallways, stairwells, cafeterias, or queueing lines. The black lower-classes have been socialized in a tradition where the willingness to adopt the postures of physical aggression is a necessity in protection of the self. The black child must act as if prepared to fight when challenged. White middle-class males are socialized away from physical aggression and toward verbal combat, while white females (particularly in the South) are trained toward a posture of deference and charm as a strategy for manipulating others. When these children encounter each other in the school crowd or on the playground, they find difficulties in establishing amicable relationships. The shoving, masculine display, and physical actions of the blacks alarm the whites. White middle-class males may then counter with verbiage, which angers the blacks, especially when the latter rely domestically on black English rather than middle-class standard English, and when they are accustomed to their own styles of verbal repartee. White females may rely on "being nice," but this tactic impresses blacks, especially black females, as submissiveness and a willingness to be pushed further. Finding the situation uncomfortable, the white children tend to withdraw or to ignore the blacks. They may also complain to parents or other authorities about the hazards of school.

Leaving the family and the neighborhood in order to attend school is a trauma for children. As the social distance from home is increased, and the separation from friends intensified, children become increasingly fearful. Unless the school authorities are able to establish an environment that reduces these fears, children find it difficult to engage in either intellectual learning or social growth. The development of positive interracial relationships remains unlikely. Meanwhile those parents who can afford to do so will respond to the anxieties of their children by removing them from the threatening environment. (We recall that Crossover, Grandin, and Wexler are becoming increasingly black in their student population; and Sheridan has steadily been loosing its white enrollment.)

If desegregation is to be meaningful, it should positively affect the experiences which students have with those of other social and cultural backgrounds ("races"). Our review indicates that this is seldom the case. In the previous chapter, we have noted how resegregation tends to occur within the academic side of school life; in the present chapter, we noted how segregation persists (or resegregation occurs) in the multiple areas dominated as extracurricular.

Whether in organized school activities, such as athletics, or student government, or social affairs (such as dances), the students tend to segregate by race. Given the traditional domination of schools by the middle and upper-class whites, blacks of the middle-class are usually marginal, with qualifications that would enable them to move either with the white elite or with the black lowerclasses. The choice is often painful, since if they rely on their intellectual abilities and middle-class traits, they are hassled by the blacks on the grounds of "acting white;" while if they allow themselves and their being to be defined in relationship to the lowerclass blacks, they reduce their chances of vocational and social mobility, while rejecting the opportunities that leads toward participation in the ecumenical high culture of the world that transcends the boundaries of nationality, ethnicity, and socialrace (Kroeber 1960; Hewes 1961). The dilemma leads some blacks to prefer schools which are all black. (Many blacks of the preceding generations have emerged from such a scholastic matrix, but it constituted a handicap inasmuch as it deprived youngsters of the opportunity to learn early how to deal with persons of differing backgrounds.)

For most students, school is perceived not as an opportunity for mastery of academic subjects in a classroom context but rather as the locus for meeting with peers and constructing joint activities. Thus, there is a continual struggle between students and educators for control. Students seek free time and vacant space where they can associate with friends in such activities as sports, music, drugs, idle sociability, dancing, conversational games, friendship, or courtship. Students pressure teachers to reduce the time devoted to classwork and homework. In groups they attempt to seize control of areas in and around the school building, be these toilet-rooms, stair landings, cafeteria zones, or portions of the school yard; they maintain control of these areas by continual defense--readiness to combat with rival groups of peers. In the schools studied, these important extracurricular activities are almost invariably segregatd by social-race. And, since they occur with only marginal control or peripheral awareness by the administration, there seems little opportunity for manipulating these in ways that would increase the likelihood of integration.

Bi-racial contacts occur most often when there is a common goal. But the majority of students did not have shared experiences and, in fact, usually did not feel part of the school. They did not participate in extracurricular activities and they took little interest in their classes--often disrupting them so that little learning could take place, and often not bothering to attend them at all. In fact, most of the schools studied were somewhat polarized into pro- and anti-school factions, with the anti school faction primarily black, Hispanic, or lowerclass white. Evidently this is not uncommon. In describing results from his study of a British grammar school, Lacey (1970) suggests that if a school differentiates among the students by emphasizing their relative ranking according to some characteristics such as academic performance, then student polarization will result. These British students responded to the formal differentiation by forming opposing groups, with the highly-ranked group developing pro-school values, and the low-ranked group developing anti-school values. McDermott (1974) found similar results in a school where students were differentiated according to pariah (lower caste or class) characteristics.

Likewise within the schools here studied, black students were polarized between those that did participate and those that didn't. Most of those who became involved in the school felt that they had to give up part of their identity as blacks, that is, they were being forced to act like whites in order to be accepted by them and into their power structure. They were being forced toward cultural assimilation. Thus, even when there was cooperation toward shared goals, this was not necessarily working toward the development (or emergence) of genuine integration. For in cooperating, one group was being forced to assimilate into the other, that is, there was no mutual acceptance and respect for cultural differences.

There were other reasons why there wasn't more interracial interaction and not all can be blamed on the structure of the schools themselves. Most of the students at the schools studied came from segregated neighborhoods. Thus, ethnic sorting took place before they ever came to school. It was more natural for these students, once they arrived in school, to choose friends from their neighborhoods or from the same background. Furthermore, the students were from varying social classes, with blacks more frequently at the bottom and whites more frequently at the top. This resulted in different upbringing and experiences that cannot be attributable to race alone. Finally, there was the gap in academic achievement, with whites usually better prepared than blacks. Thus, they were almost always separated in school, either as a result of rigid tracking systems, or varying curricula. (Only at Grandin was there a real attempt at mainstreaming.)

VI. Interpretive Comments

The five schools which were the subjects of these studies would be ranked among the better institutions. In three cases (Crossover, Pawnee, Wexler) the very buildings were new, and in two of these cases the facilities were among the best in the district and, in some senses, even luxurious.

Gaining access to the conduct of an ethnographic study of an institution is seldom easy. The administrators who consent to such intimate and prolonged study of their institutions must have confidence that, relatively speaking, these are among the best of their kind so that there is little to be found of incompetence of misfeasance. The research findings sustain these evaluations, on a relative basis. Because of those positive judgments, the research teams have been reticent in their publications. How single out for critical view the particular institution that was studied, when, relative to the others, it is so much better?

It needs then to be emphasized that we are not here portraying the seamier aspects of desegregation. But the very merits of the school studied does provided the analysts with a certain advantage. Clearly revealed to our gaze are the difficulties of desegregation: the ubiquitous tendencies to resegregate, and the small level of achievement in integration. That this should be true should not be surprising. More than a legislative rule or a court order are required if desegregation is to be socially meaningful or scholastically productive.

The students who enter a public school differ from each other in many ways. The magnitude of these differences is accentuated with desegregation and the deliberate attempts at mingling of populations from different areas of the school district. In their settlement within a metropolitan area, peoples have tended to sort themselves by ethnicity, religious affiliation, social class, and social race; an incentive to this sorting has been the desire to have their children schooled with others of their kind. The desegregation process attempts to reverse these sortings and thus results in schools with student populations that are more than usually diverse, not only in ethnicity and social-race, but in age, social-class, scholastic background, and basic experiences with the world.

The traditional school attempted to achieve economy and efficiency by grouping children so that classes were composed of units that were alike, whereupon the educator could apply to them a common treatment (or curriculum). This rationale underlies the basic system of sorting children by grade levels associated with age and of then subdividing the graded children according to measured performance on tests of ability--in short, tracking. But with its diversified student population, the desegregated school should properly operate with an equally diversified system of sortings or groupings. Educational pluralism (so to speak) would be the counterpart of the cultural pluralism on the larger social scene. Unhappily, neither educational theory nor educational practicioners are prepared for such a reorientation, and the larger community would be initially dubious. Assisted by the federal government, some schools (e.g. Sheridan) have introduced Ethnic Studies units, but in most cases these have had only a modest impact toward the achievement of pluralism.

Rather than pluralism, the school tends to rely on a linear approach, typified by academic success or failure, where success is defined in terms of traditional competencies, rather than reaching beyond these to polycultural or Great Traditional learnings (Wax and Wax 1971a; Redfield 1956; Singer 1960). Middle-class parents and children fit into the traditional linear model and therein often enjoy some degree of success; minority and lower-class children find themselves consigned to the less qualified portion of the scale and then respond by becoming alienated from the school and subversive of its attempts at formal learning.

Early in this report we noted the theories of Allport, Pettigrew and others that integration must be grounded in a matrix of equality. Within the school situation, such equality can only be premised on cultural and educational pluralism, and that would require a large-scale reconceptualization of traditional educational practices. In default of this reconceptualization, educators have responded to the challenge of desegregation by two basic techniques: first, a taboo on the recognition of differences of social-race (and associated subcultures); second, by a simplifying--or leveling downward--in curriculum. The effect of the taboo is to deny not only to children, but even to the educators themselves, any chance of coping with interracial relationships by discussion, analysis and reflection. The effect of the leveling downward is to generate discontent in traditional teachers --who conceive that "academics" are being neglected and "standards" lowered--and to conspire with the students to limit the demands placed upon them for formal learning.

Schools are much more than institutions for formal education; they are also arenas for a considerable variety of other activities, especially those initiated by students themselves. With regard to interracial relations, the evidence from these studies indicates that segregation (or resegregation) is the norm in these areas. For most students, the patterns of association within the school are derived from those of neighborhood association. Not only social-race, but equally the characteristics of sex (gender), social class, and age serve to determine the boundaries of friendship and cooperation. The formal activities sponsored by the school -- e.g. athletics or student government--might conceivably provide the occasion for integrated activity, but the educator who can devote the intelligence and energy to that goal is rare; and, in default of that leadership, the activities quickly become either segregated or so dominated by one or another of the racial cliques as to discourage participation by all but the most ardent of the persons from a different background.

Putting integration aside as idealistic goal, we can ask about the achievement of desegregation. Here the answer is both positive and ambiguous. For the students in these schools, desegregation is some sort of reality: their students peers include members of other ethnic groups and social-races. Overt violence has been avoided, and school life proceeds on course. White and black students state that they find the desegregated school tolerable and that they are profiting from the opportunity to make contact with the other social-race. However, it is clear that white students are being withdrawn from several of these schools: rapidly from Crossover, slowly from Grandin and Wexler, and

gradually from Sheridan. If these tendencies persist, then despite the fact that desegregation of schools has been shown to be feasible, the country will be left with numerous resegregated schools. While this may provoke some interest groups toward further court action with a view toward enlarging school districts and the concomitant area within which students are transported, it might also encourage some reflection about the policies which have underlain desegregation. Do we need different procedures and different goals?

The Value of Ethnographic Studies of Schools

In areas of intense public controversy--such as desegregating the public schools--the results of research investigations rarely find a receptive hearing among the political publics. The political actor seeks either ammunition for a cause or magically quick resolutions which will propitiate all parties. Since the truth is often complex, an unbiased research usually has a word of criticism implicitly about every significant party, so that its remedies seem unpleasantly bitter, troublesome, utopian, and even unintelligible. The mass media seem more helpful, especially television which specializes in converting complicated social issues into three-minute simplistic dramas.

Nevertheless, and in the long run, research truth can be a help. We are far better off knowing the actualities of desegregation from these five studies than we would be if we relied simply on rumor and the dramatic portrayals of the mass media. Unpopular as it may sound to those who prefer a "quick fix," the most obvious conclusion from these studies, and the foregoing summary, is that continued ethnographic efforts can provide policy makers with accurate knowledge about what is occurring in the schools. When such studies are placed in the context of the development and application of relevant theory and concepts, we have the possibility of pursuing national social goals with more intelligence and less hardship.

It is tempting to think that because racial segregation and oppression were morally wrong, then integration and equality should be simple, always morally just, and easy to achieve. But where so many rival interest groups are involved, and so much political passion aroused, no course of action is simple, or easy, or without the possibility of harming some gro Under these circumstances, we should not expect to achieve school integration by court order, any more than we could have succeeded in landing men on the moon simply by declaring that a national policy. Good research, such as represented by these five studies, allows us to step back from the task and to consider afresh what it is that we hope that our schools will provide for our children.

Reference Notes

1. Responding to the pressures of school administrators, civil rights groups, and a variety of other pressure groups and lobbies, Congress has modified its package of assistance to school districts in almost every session. Beside Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the acts have included Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), Emergency School Assistance Program, and Title VII of the Elementary School Aid Act (1972).

The Rand Corporation has reviewed (Crocker, et al. 1976) the operations of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act and concluded that "desegregation assistance funds have largely been used to supplement ordinary school expenditures, especially for compensatory education. Little seems to have been done to focus funds on making desegregation work."

2. See also Pettigrew (1967). The view that acceptance by white peers beneficially affects the scholastic achievement of black children has been subjected to critique by Maruyama and Miller (n.d.) who have reanalyzed the data presented by Lewis and St. John (1974). As Schofield writes (1978; personal communication to M.L.Wax), "it's terribly difficult from the data I know of to say whether the friendship leads to achievement or vice versa." Relevant as background is Weinberg's 1977 summary on minority students.

3. These judgments (Katz 1971; Karier, Violas, and Spring 1973; et al.) have been subjected to severe criticisms by Ravitch (1978).

4. In the method that generally has been employed by anthropologists, each item of conduct has been placed within the context of the whole (Redfield 1955:156; Firth 1951:18; Steward 1950:21). Mead notes (1978: 432) that from the inception of the Society for Applied Anthropology in the early 1940s: "Anthropologists, we said, dealt with wholes--whole systems, whole institutions, whole societies, ultimately the whole world. Our task, in any particular case, was to define the whole within which we were working--a factory, a school system, a hospital, a political unit, an ecological unit--and then act in terms of the good of the whole....Practically, it meant that an applied anthropoligist would refuse to be retained by management without the consent of labor, by a colonial bureaucracy without the involvement of the people being governed, by a hospital administration without taking the patients' feelings and wishes into account. This is, of course, unacceptable to any group who feels that their cause or position is right and those of others--management, labor, the establishment, the hierarchy, the agitators, the prison population--are either negligible or wrong."

5. This report is an attempt to integrate and simplify the findings of these studies; however, space limitations do not permit us to give as much detail as the reader might like. We suggest that those who want to read the full reports contact the Desegregation Studies Section, NIE.

6. Giles (1978) has analyzed data on 60 school districts and approximately 1600 schools located in southern SMSAs. He concludes that "higher percent black enrollments are found to be associated with the rate of white withdrawal at both the district and the school levels." The relationship is curvilinear with white withdrawal increasing exponentially with black enrollments over 30 percent.

7. Anthropologists of education, developmental psychologists, and linguists have been researching cognitive styles and associated linguistic competencies. The volume edited by Cazden, John, and Hymes (1972) and Leacock (1971) contain the results of such investigations, especially of American Indian tribal groups. It is important to bear in mind that the effective unit is not a racial population, but a cultural-linguistic unit, such as that portion of an Indian tribe which maintains the traditional language (e.g. Hopi "fullbloods"). Traditional Western education has operated with gross misunderstandings of the development of the child's speech and of the roles of dialect; much research is underway (cf. Labov 1969; Hymes 1971; Cazden 1976).

8. The use of space and time mechanisms to control behavior in secondary schools is not an unusual phenomena. Schedules serve many functions in addition to physically controlling students. They serve to fractionalize learning through the compartmentalization of knowledge (Cusick 1973); to control the rhythm and pace of learning by insuring that X comes before Y, hence, regulating "status passage" (Glaser and Strauss 1971) and, to support the sense of control and authority of key actors in the school situation (Lyman and Scott 1970). Moreover, control over time tends to become one of the features in student-teacher conflict (Geer 1966) and aberrant "timetables" are useful in the identification of deviance (Roth 1963). Finally, time may directly affect the quality of hope that indirectly affects motivation (Henry 1965).

9. Athletic prowess becomes a snare for ambitious black males, since many are tempted to dedicate themselves to achieving high levels of competency, while simultaneously disdaining competence in formal academic subjects. Given the small number of career openings in professional sport, the black males who have adopted this scholastic orientation find themselves in a vocational deadend after leaving school.

Bibliography

Allport, Gordon W.
1954 The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Barnes, J.A.
1954 Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish. Human Relations 7:39-58.
1968 Networks and Political Process. In M. Swartz (ed.), Local Level Politics. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 107-128.

Becker, Howard S.
1951 Role and Career Problems of the Chicago Public School Teacher. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago.
1958 Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation. American Sociological Review, 28: 652-660.
1970 Sociological Work. Chicago: Aldine.

Bem, D.
1972 Self-Perception Theory. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 6). New York: Academic.

Blumer, Herbert
1969 Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bowles, Samuel, and Gintis, Herbert
1976 Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books.

Bruyn, Severyn
1963 The Methodology of Participant Observation. Human Organization 22: 222-234.
1966 The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Burnett, Jacquetta Hill
1969 Ceremony Rites and Economy in the Student System of an American High School. Human Organization 28:1-10.

Cassell, Joan
1978 A Fieldwork Manual for the Study of Desegregated Schools. Washington DC: National Institute of Education.

Cazden, Courtney B.
1976 Dialect Differences and Bilingualism. In Roberts and Akinsanya 1976, pp. 353-386.

Cazden, Courtney, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes, (eds.)
1972 Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cicourel, Aaron V.
1964 Method and Measurement in Sociology. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, David K., and Weiss, Janet A.
1976 Social Science and Social Policy: Schools and Race. In Education, Social Science, and the Judicial Process: An International Symposium. Washington DC: The National Institute of Education, pp. 55-70.

Cohen, Elizabeth G.
1975 The Effects of Desegregation on Race Relations. Law and Contemporary Problems 39:271-299.

Coleman, James S.
1959 Academic Achievement and the Structure of Competition. Harvard Educational Review 29:399-351.
1961 The Adolescent Society. New York: Free Press.

Crain, Robert L.
1976 Why Academic Research Fails to Be Useful. School Review 84:337-351.

Crocker, Stephen, et al.
1976 Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation (R-1901/2).

Cusick, Philip A.
1973 Inside High School: The Student's World. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Denzin, Norman K.
1970 The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldine.

Denzin, Norman K. (ed.)
1970 The Values of Social Science. Trans-Action Books: Aldine.
1978 Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Devereaux, George
1967 From Anxiety to Method in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Humanities Press.

Dumont, Robert V., Jr.
1972 Learning English and How to Be Silent: Studies in Sioux and Cherokee Classrooms. Pp. 344-369 in Functions of Language in the Classroom, edited by Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dumont, Robert V., Jr., and Murray L. Wax
1969 The Cherokee School Society and the Intercultural Classroom. Human Organization 18(3): 217-226. Reprinted, pp. 205-216 in Schooling in the Cultural Context: Anthropological Studies of

Education, edited by Joan I. Roberts and Sherrie K. Akinsanya. New York: Longmans.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E.
1951 Social Anthropology. London: Cohen & West.

Festinger, Leon
1957 Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Firth, Raymond
1951 Elements of Social Organization. London: Watts.

Forehand, G.A., and Ragosta, M.
1976 A Handbook for Integrated Schooling. (HEW-OEC-0-73-6341). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Freilich, Morris (ed.)
1970 Marginal Natives: Anthropologists at Work. New York: Harper and Row.

Geer, Blanche
1966 Occupational Commitments and the Teaching Profession. School Review 74 (Spring).

Geertz, Clifford
1973 The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Giles, Michael W.
1978 White Enrollment Stability and School Desegregation: A Two-Level Analysis. American Sociological Review 43 (6):848-864.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss
1967 The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine.
1971 Status Passage. Chicago: Aldine.

Havighurst, Robert J., et al.
1962 Growing Up in River City. New York: Wiley.

Henry, Jules
1963 Culture Against Man. New York: Random House.

Hewes, Gordon W.
1961 The Ecumene as a Civilizational Multiplier System. Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers 25:73-110.

Hollingshead, August B.
1949 Elmtown's Youth. New York: Wiley.

Hymes, Dell
1971 On Linguistic Theory, Communicative Competence, and the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Pp. 51-66 in Wax, Gearing, and Diamond 1971.

Jencks, Christopher, et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Johnson, Norris B.
1976 An Ethnographic and Longitudinal Methodology for the Description and Illustration of Schooling as Cultural Transmission. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Karier, Clarence J., Violas, Paul, and Spring, Joel
1973 Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Katz, I.
1964 Review of Evidence Relating to Effects of Desegregation on the Performance of Negroes. American Psychologist 19:381-399.

Katz, Michael B.
197. Class Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. Expanded edition (1st edition 1971). New York: Praeger.

Kimball, Solon T., and James B. Watson, (eds.)
1972 Crossing Cultural Boundaries. San Francisco: Chandler.

Kroeber, Alfred L.
1960 The Ancient Oikoumene as a Historic Culture Aggregate. Pp. 379-395 in The Nature of Culture. Selected papers of A.L. Kroeber. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Labov, Roger
1969 The Logic of NonStandard English. Pp. 153-189 in F. Williams, (ed.).

Lacey, Colin
1970 Hightown Grammar: The School as a Social System. Manchester, Eng.: The University Press.

Leacock, Eleanor B.
1969 Teaching and Learning in City Schools: A Comparative Study. NY: Basic Books.

Leacock, Eleanor B. (ed.)
1971 The Culture of Poverty: A Critique. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Lewis, R., and Nancy St. John
1974 Contribution of Cross-Racial Friendship to Minority Group Achievement in Desegregated Schools. Sociometry 37:79-91.

Lyman, S. M., and Scott, M.B.
1970 A Sociology of the Absurd. NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Maruyama, Geoffrey, and Norman Miller
n.d. Re-examination of Normative Influence Processes in Desegregated Classrooms. Unpublished paper, University of Minnesota Graduate School.

McCall, George J., and J.L. Simmons, (eds.)
1969 Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

McDermott, R. R.
1974 Achieving School Failure: An Anthropological Approach to Illiteracy and Social Stratification. In G.A. Spindler (ed.), Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education. NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston pp. 82-118.

Mead, Margaret
1978 The Evolving Ethics of Applied Anthropology. Pp. 425-437 in Applied Anthropology in America, edited by Elizabeth M. Eddy and William L. Partridge. NY: Columbia University Press.

Ogbu, John U.
1974 The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood. NY: Academic Press.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1967 Social Evaluation Theory: Convergences and Applications. In D. Levine (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 15). Lincoln: U of Nebraska Press.
1969 Race and Equal Educational Opportunity. In Equal Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review. Cambridge: Harvard U Press.
1973 The Case for the Racial Integration of the Schools. In O. Duff (ed.), Report on the Future of School Desegregation in the United States. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh. Consultative Resource Center on School Desegregation and Conflict.

Ravitch, Diane
1974 The Great School Wars: A History of the Public Schools, A Battleground for Change. NY: Basic Books.
1978 The Revisionists Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on the Schools. NY: Basic Books.

Redfield, Robert
1955 The Little Community: Viewpoints for the Study of a Human Whole. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.

1956 Peasant Society and Culture. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.

Rist, Ray C.
1973 The Urban Schools: A Factory for Failure. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press.
1974 Race, Policy, and Schooling. Society 12 (1):59-63.
1975 Ethnographic Techniques and and the Study of an Urban School. Urban Education 10:86-106.
1976 School Integration: Ideology, Methodology, and National Policy. School Review 84:417-430.

Roberts, Joan I., and Sherrie K. Akinsanya
1976 Schooling in the Cultural Context: Anthropological Studies of Education. NY: Longmans (David McKay).

Rogers, David
1968 110 Livingston Street. NY: Random House.

Roth, Julia A.
1963 Timetables: Structuring the Passage of Time in Hospital Treatment and Other Careers. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

St. John, Nancy
1975 School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. NY: Wiley.

Schatzman, Leonard and Anselm L. Strauss
1973 Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schofield, Janet
1972 A Framework for Viewing the Relation between Attitudes and Behavior. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.

Scrupski, Adam
1975 The Social System of the School. In N.K. Shimahara and A. Scrupski (eds.) Social Forces and Schooling. NY: David McKay.

Seeley, John R.
1967 Social Science: Some Probative Problems. Crestwood Heights: A Transaction. In The Americanization of the Unconscious. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Singer, Milton B.
1960 The Great Tradition of Hinduism in the City of Madras. In Anthropology of Folk Religions, edited by Charles Leslie. NY: Random House (Reprinted from Journal of American Folklore 71:347-388).

Spindler, George, ed.
1970 Being an Anthropologist: Fieldwork in Eleven Cultures. NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Srinivas, Mysore N., and Andre Beteille
1964 Networks in Indian Social Structure. Man 69:165-168.

Steward, Julian H.
1950 Area Research: Theory and Practice. NY: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin No. 63.

Truzzi, Marcello, ed.
1974 Verstehen: Subjective Understanding in the Social Sciences. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
1967 Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wax, Murray L.
1970 Sociology. Pp. 39-51 in Anthropology and the Behavioral and Health Sciences, edited by Otto von Mering and Leonard Kasdan. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh Press.

Wax, Murray L., Stanley Diamond, and Fred O. Gerings, editors.
1971 Anthropological Perspectives on Education. NY: Basic Books.

Wax, Murray L., and Rosalie H. Wax
1971a Great Tradition, Little Tradition, and Formal Education. In Wax, Murray L., Fred O. Gearing, and Stanley Diamond (eds.), pp. 3-18, Anthropological Perspectives on Education. NY: Basic Books.
1971b Cultural Deprivation as an Educational Ideology. Pp. 127-139 in The Culture of Poverty: A Critique, edited by Eleanor B. Leacock. NY: Simon and Schuster.

Wax, Rosalie H.
1971 Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.

Weaver, Tom, and White, D.
1972 Sociological Contributions to an Urban Anthropology. In T. Weaver and D. White (eds.), The Anthropology of Urban Environments. Society for Applied Anthropology, Monograph Series No. 11.

Weinberg, Meyer
1970 Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
1977 Minority Students: A Research Appraisal. Washington DC: National Institute of Education.

Williams, Frederick, editor
1970 Language and Poverty: Perspectives on a Theme. Chicago: Markham.

PART II

CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE PORTRAIT

I. Desegregation, Integration, and Interaction Theory: An Appraisal

by

John U. Ogbu

Introduction:

A new theoretical perspective emerged in the social sciences during the second half of the 1960s about school desegregation and its outcomes. It criticized prevailing studies for lacking in theory of desegregation and for over-reliance on survey and experimental methods. It suggested that these were deficiences that might account for the inconclusiveness of research findings on school desegregation (Clement et al. 1976; Wax 1979). The new theoretical perspective--which I call interaction theory--posits that (a) black students would improve their academic achievement if they attended school with white middle-class students who provided them with models of success in school and later life; (b) positive influences of white middle-class peers would be enchanced if the two racial groups interacted on a friendly and cooperative basis at school; and (c) interracial friendship and cooperation would develop among the students if school authorities actively encouraged them. It is the new theoretical perspective which guided the five ethnographic studies reported on in this present volume. To evaluate the findings and methodology reported here I shall first discuss the theoretical and methodological issues of earlier studies and the context in which the interaction theory arose. Then I shall examine the findings of the five studies and suggest additional reasons for their negativity.

Equal Access Theory and Earlier Studies of Desegregation:

Studies of school desegregation before 1966 were based on what might be called "equal access theory." This theory was derived from the conventional definition of equality of educational opportunity. Before 1966 the latter meant only that children in a given local community should have equal access to the same schools and the same curriculum, free of charge (Coleman 1969:18; Ogbu 1974:206). Blacks in the South did not, as a rule, have access to white schools in their local communities before the United States Supreme Court decision of 1954 which abolished dual school systems as unconstitutional; in addition, black schools were generally inferior to white schools. Desegregation therefore meant the abolition of dual schools and the granting to blacks and white children equal access to the same school resources (Ashmore 1954; Clement et al.1976; Ogbu 1978a). A close examination of arguments for desegregation before the 1960s shows that the major concerns were both to end legal dual school systems and to give blacks and whites equal access to school resources. What happened inside desegregated schools was not seen to affect equality of educational opportunity for either the majority or the minority child. Most studies of desegregation did not, therefore, focus on such processes or events.

With the above definition of equality of educational opportunity, the preoccupation of earlier studies with measurement of desegregation outcomes, particularly academic outcomes, becomes understandable. However, other assumptions also encouraged social scientists to focus on measuring academic, psychological, and social outcomes of desegregation. Perhaps the best way to characterize the many questions researchers sought to answer prior to 1966 is to designate them as The Promise Of Brown. The Promise Of Brown was not necessarily the same for black parents, civil rights organizations and their leaders, lawyers and the courts, white liberals and white conservatives, and various categories of social scientists. But for social scientists, The Promise Of Brown--however defined--provided "testable hypotheses" regarding the academic, psychological, and social outcomes of desegregation (See Bell 1972: 36-37; Clement et al. 1976:2-26; Bryce 1976; Derian 1972; Editors, Harvard Educational Review, 1975:2; Kirp 1976:576-579; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1973; 1977; Weinberg 1977:21-26; Wilkins 1972:24).

Academic Achievement: Even a casual examination of the pattern of black schooling before 1954 shows that conventional definitions of equality of educational opportunity did not apply to blacks in the South. Not only did blacks not have access to white schools, but there were also gross differences in the schools of the two races: in buildings (e.g., size, arrangements, and appearance); physical facilities; distance travelled to school by children; curriculum; length of school terms; professional qualification of teachers; systems of grading and promoting students; and extracurricular activities (Ashmore 1954:109-110; Ogbu 1978a:70). To black Americans and to some social scientists these differences were seen as a major cause of lower black shool performance. Hence, desegregation would enable blacks to achieve the conventional definition of equality of educational opportunity and, subsequently, to improve their school performance, For most blacks, The Promise Of Brown was not only to end legal segregation, to go to school with white people and to get along with them; more importantly, The Promise Of Brown was to achieve equality of educational opportunity (Bell 1972:37, 40; Clement et al. 1976:8; Kirp 1976:579; Weinberg 1977:26). But just as blacks and some social scientists argued that black lower test scores were due to unequal access to school resources and to quality education, many white Southerners and educators used the lower test scores as evidence that blacks were mentally inferior to whites and should not attend the same schools as whites (Weinberg 1977: 97-101). Whose interpretations was right--that of advocates of school desegregation or that of the opposing side? It is in this context that we can see why social scientists focused on academic outcomes of desegregation.

Until 1966 many social scientists really believed that unequal school resources caused unequal academic achievement, especially among blacks. Coleman's survey (1966) seriously cast doubts on the access theory by suggesting both that black and white schools in every part of the country had about equal resources in the mid-1960s and that where differences in school resources existed they did not seem to account for black-white differences in school performance. Coleman's finding that black and white schools were nearly equal in resources represented a significant change since Brown. It was after Brown that many states in the South spent large sums of money to bring black schools up to the

standards of white schools rather than desegregate their schools (Bullock 1970; Ogbu 1978a: 73). Undoubtedly, Brown had a rippling effect in the North.

Coleman's other finding that differences in school resources did not account for black-white gap in test scores does not mean that such differences in resources in some places and some times did not significantly affect black school performance. Consider the effect of differences in length of school term. Social scientists have used the average length of school term as a measure of educational opportunity, regarding it as the length of time children actually spend in educational pursuits. Before Brown we mght find a Southern dual school system in which over a 12-year period of public education, white children received 65.6 months of instruction while blacks received 57.6 months of instruction. Unless the black children were "extra smart" it seems reasonable to expect that they would not learn as much as their white peers and would probably not do as well on a test of academic achievement (Bullock 1970:176-177).

For most blacks the first step in the fullfillment of The Promise Of Brown was equalization of access to quality education through desegregation. It was expected that that would eventually lead to improved academic achievement of black children.

Psychological and Social Outcomes: Social scientists, black and white--but not necessarily the black masses, expected that school desegregation would improve black "self-concept." As far back as the 1930s some psychologists had hypothesized that social stigma attached to being black generated low self-image among black Americans. Their research also indicated that racial self-awareness developed quite early in life; that very young black children learned negative labels and meanings attached to being black and superior labels and meanings attached to being white. Both black and white children, it was suggested, tended to associate positive character traits with white people and negative ones with black people. Research findings on this issue by Clark and Clark (1947) were later used as evidence in the Brown case. Later s[illegible]ies confirmed earlier findings. (see Clement et al. 1976:50-53; [illegible]nberg 1977:159-163). Thus for these social scientists an important aspect of The Promise Of Brown included the possibility that desegregation would improve black self-image, reduce social stigma attached to being black, and improve race relations by making blacks more acceptable to whites.

Survey And Experimental Approaches: If The Promise Of Brown in terms of academic achievement, self-image, and race relations can be called "testable hypotheses," they were the kind of hypotheses that lent themselves easily to survey and experimental methods. The evidence supporting each of these hypotheses has, however, been found inconclusive. Studies of black academic achievement under desegregation show mixed results; furthermore, although some black students attending desegregated schools improve their school performance, the gap between black and white students generally remains or widens. (Findings about black self-image, interracial acceptance and interracial interaction and friendship networks are also mixed [see Collins and Noblit 1976:75; Clement et al. 1976:49-53; Bell 1975; Kirp 1976:603; Lines 1972: 26-27; Riffel et al. 1976; St. John 1975:16-40; Weinberg 1977: 108, 159-168]).

It can be said that during the first 10 years, perhaps with the exception of equalization of school resources, there was no significant evidence to support The Promise Of Brown. Dual school systems remained as before; desegregation, where it occurred, did not lead to conclusive evidence that it improved black academic achievement and self-image or that it resulted in better race relations.

Interaction Theory Emerges in the 1960s:

The more or less disappointing research findings on the results of school desegregation contributed to growing disillusionment over access theory and to the emergence of interaction theory. Particularly important for the latter was the rise of competing theories purporting to explain the lower school performance among blacks and the poor and the alternative remedies they suggested.

As noted earlier, the equal access theory was seriously undermined when the Coleman report (1966) suggested that what differences existed in school resources did not appear to explain black-white gap in academic achievement. At the same time the report contributed to the development of the interaction theory by positing what later came to be called Coleman's "peer learning theory," which states that low-income children benefitted academically from being in the same school with middle- and upper-income children. Some people interpreted the peer learning theory to mean that desegregation along class lines would improve students' academic achievement. And, as most blacks fall within the low-income category, desegregation along class lines would also become desegregation along race lines (Clement et al. 1976:26). The Coleman report thus generated a new conception of desegregation: a school is desegregated for the purpose of improving academic achievement and other outcomes, if it involved mixing black students with white students from middle- and upper-income backgrounds.

Coleman's peer learning theory is based on certain assumptions about the role of the family and community in the transmission of academic orientation and skills to children. His data suggested to him that children's academic success depended more on values and skills they bring to school than on the resources offered by the school. He summarized this point of view by saying:

> Altogether, the sources of inequality of educational opportunity appears to lie first in the home itself, and the cultural influence immediately surrounding the home; then they lie in the schools' ineffectiveness to free achievement from the impact of the home, and in the schools' cultural homogeneity which perpetuates social influences of the home and its environs. (Cited in Mosteller and Moynihan 1972: 20; see also U.S. Senate Select Committee, Report 1972:87).

The idea that children's family and community backgrounds play a crucial role in school learning did not originate with the Coleman report. The report was merely reinforcing an already widespread explanation of black school failure. Attempts to explain black academic failure in terms of their "cultural background" date back to the second half of the 1950s when "intervention programs" were instituted in some cities like New

York and St. Louis, Mo. (Gordon and Wilkerson 1965; Ogbu 1978a: 84). By 1962 these children had come to be designated as "the culturally deprived" (Riessman 1962); furthermore, some social scientists had come to believe that "the basic set toward learning" is developed during preschool years and all that takes place later is "an addition of experience into the 'preordained categories'"(Kerber and Bommarito 1965:346; see also U.S. Senate Select Committee Report 1972: 77-82). The importance social scientists were increasingly attaching to preschool learning and their perception of black children as coming from culturally deprived homes led to initiation of early intervention programs in several urban ghettos. Two conferences held in Columbia University in 1962 (Passow 1963) and at the University of Chicago in 1963 (Bloom, Davis and Hess 1965) focused on the need for more intervention programs. The Chicago conference concluded that most black children--about 70%--were culturally deprived, that their homes could not effectively prepare them to succeed in school like white middle-class children, and that the schools must go beyond providing all children with equal access to their resources and institute special programs to compensate the children for the deficiencies they bring with them to school (Bloom, Davis and Hess 1965:4, 5, 12, 16, 6). These conferences were basically calling for compensatory education "which can prevent or overcome earlier deficiencies in the development of each child" (ibid:6; emphasis added).

Cultural Deprivation Theory, Peer Learning Theory and Interaction Theory: Both cultural deprivation theory and peer learning theory greatly influenced the thinking of the advocates of school desegregation. Cultural deprivation theory did this in two ways. First, it suggest that in terms of academic achievement, the children's family or cultural background was to be taken into account in addition to the degree of their access to school resources (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967:80-81; U.S. Senate Select Committee Report 1972:77). Second, the remedy proposed by the theory in the form of compensatory education was interpreted as an alternative and a threat to desegregation. Proponents of desegregation responded by saying that while compensatory education was "politically expedient" it would not improve black academic achievement (Pettigrew 1969a:85). Yet propoents of school desegregation could not ignore entirely the insistence of researchers on preschool influence of black homes, on the effects of early intervention programs such as those reported by Martin Deutsch in Harlem, and reports of conferences and workshops on the educational problems of the "culturally deprived" and of "depressed areas" (see Bloom, Davis and Hess 1965; Deutsch 1963; Little and Smith 1971; Passow 1963; Rees 1968). But proponents of desegregation rejected compensatory education as an alternative to desegregation because the former did not address some fundamental aspects of The Promise Of Brown, such as improvement of race relations (Pettigrew 1969a, 1969b; U.S. Senate Select Committee Report 1972).

Coleman's peer learning hypothesis solved the problem for advocates of desegregation by suggesting also that there might be a connection between race, social class, and academic achievement. This connection was sought by reanalyzing relevant data in the Coleman survey. Coleman's report had suggested that white and black children tended to do better when they were in school with predominantly white middle-class milieu

and that most black children from "more than half" white classrooms scored higher on both reading and mathematical achievement tests than other black children, especially if they had begun their interracial schooling in the early grades. The reanalysis of the data revealed the racial significance of the peer learning theory by controlling for family social class and school social class. The reanalysis showed that there were "apparent interracial benefits," though not linear in interracial schooling: [blacks] in predominantly white classrooms scored higher on the average than those [all-black] classrooms. [Furthermore], this effect of improved performance appears greatest for those [black] children who begin their biracial training in the early grades" (Pettigrew 1969a:73-74; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967: 81-85; U.S. Senate Select Committee Report 1972:220).

The Coleman report also contributed to the emerging distinction between desegregated and integrated schools. The report, for example, revealed that blacks in all desegregated schools did not improve their academic achievement. The reanalysis of Coleman data indicated that black children who scored higher on the achievement tests were attending desegregated schools where there was interracial acceptance, i.e., "where most teachers reported no racial tension whatsoever" (Pettigrew 1969a:74; 1969b:74-75, see also Nevas 1977). Such schools came to be designated as integrated and contrasted with desegregated schools which only met "a specification of the racial mixing of students, preferably more than half white."

Let us summarize the development of the interaction theory. At the beginning of the 1960s the proponents of desegregation argued that mixing white and black students in the same schools and classrooms was necessary (a) to provide them with equal access to school resources available to whites and that would result in improved black academic achievement; (b) to enable blacks to improve their self-concept; and (c) to promote interracial acceptance. By the end of the 1960s the proponents had made a significant change in their thinking. This change was partly due to the emergence of cultural deprivation theory and compensatory education as an alternative explanation and solution respectively to black school failure; the change was also due to various elements in the Coleman report. As a result, social scientists began to argue that integration rather than desegregation was required to achieve The Promise Of Brown. And they defined integration as involving not only racial mix in a given proportion but also a climate of interracial acceptance. The implication of this change is that black children would benefit most from their white peers if they attended integrated schools or schools where there was interracial acceptance, not merely desegregated schools.

Thus what emerged by the end of the 1960s is essentially an interaction theory. It contends that it is not mere equal access to school resources, nor greater access to those resources in the form of compensatory education, that fulfilled The Promise Of Brown. Rather, the essential element is the opportunity for black children to interact in mutually accepting manner with their white middle-class peers who provide them with models of success in school and later life (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967:106). The environment of an integrated school, according to the theory, offers "substantial support for higher achievement and asipirations" because

> The majority of children in such schools do not have problems of self-confidence due to race, and the schools are not stigmatized as inferior. The students are likely to assume that they will succeed in school and their future careers, for the school often reflects the mainstream of American society. The environment in such schools is well endowed with models of academic and occupational success (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967:105; see also U.S. Senate Select Committee Report 1972:220; Ogbu 1978a: 71).

Because integration can only occur in desegregated schools, a crucial question is why do some desegregated schools become integrated while others do not? Another question is, how does the process of integration take place after a school has become desegregated?

Methodological Implications: The methodological implications of the new, interaction theory have more to do with the above two process questions than with the traditional definition of The Promise Of Brown. Even in integrated schools, survey and experimental methods can be used to assess students' academic achievements, self-concepts, and interracial interaction and friendship networks. However, surveys and experiments are not suitable for studying how school authorities promote friendly race relations, how students respond to efforts of school authorities, or how the emergent race relations among the students encourage or impede their academic efforts. To get at these things requires extended and detailed observations and interviews, such as is usually carried out in anthropological fieldwork. It requires, in other words, the ethnographic approach.

The Five Ethnographic Studies:

Conditions Required for Integration: The present volume reports findings from five ethnographic studies which shared some basic assumptions of the interaction theory. They focus primarily on one aspect of the interaction theory, namely, the evolution of integrated from desegregated schools. They do not directly probe the relationship between integration and the usual outcome measures of desegregation --academic achievement, self-concept and the like -- but they do reveal much interesting information on such matters.

As previously indicated, past studies cannot be criticized as lacking in theoretical perspectives. They subscribed to the access theory which compelled the researchers to focus on the fulfillment of The Promise Of Brown. The present studies focusing on the evolution of integrated from desegregated schools needed a different theory. They took as a guiding hypothesis Allport's (1953) "equal status contact theory." This theory, as summarized in the Introduction argues that:

> intergroup contact may reinforce previously held stereotypes and increase hostility unless the contact situation is structured in a way that provides equal status for minority and majority group members and provides strong institutional support for positive relations. Allport also stressed the necessity of cooperative interaction aimed toward the achievement of shared goal. Unless these conditions are met, he asserts that improvements in intergroup relations is unlikely.

One fundamental assumption underlying the present studies is that "[integration] is achieved only when Allport's conditions for fostering positive intergroup contact have been met."

Equal status contact in the context of desegregated schools is defined by Pettigrew as involving (a) equal access to sources of social status (e.g., all levels of school staff positions, all formal and informal student positions such as student council membership, classroom groupings for instructional purposes, etc.) and (b) equal access to physical facilities and materials. Such an equal status contact takes place and results in integration only if school authorities actively promote "equal status, cooperation, and intergroup relations."

The five studies were predicated on a rejection of the assimilationist ideology component of Allport's interaction theory. Integration, according to these studies, is not therefore measured by the extent to which black students have learned to act in appropriate white middle-class manner. Rather, integration includes a recognition of and respect for cultural pluralism while building friendly interaction and cooperation between the racial groups in contact.

Methodological: Some of the five studies were carried out by non-anthropologists, but all were essentially ethnographic in method (Cassell 1978). Ethnographic fieldwork seems most appropriate for studying conditions under which integrated schools develop from desegregated ones. Through a long period of continued participant-observation, the ethnographer can ascertain the extent to which efforts of school authorities have or have not encouraged equal status contact, cooperation, and interracial acceptance and friendship networks among the students. The ethnographic method also permits researchers to examine external factors influencing the emergence of integration, though this was not done systematically in the present studies.

Findings: Turning to research findings summarized in the monograph, we learn that the desegregated schools did not develop into integrated ones (Wax 1979) for several reasons: the schools were not reorganized according to the theory or stipulations of Allport and Pettigrew, to achieve integration; the students did not respond in ways that promoted interracial friendly interaction and relations where they had the opportunity to do so; and there were some external forces which worked against the development of integration. Not one of the five schools studied, according to the summary report, met completely all of Pettigrew's criteria for integration. And most of the monograph takes up the explanation of why integration failed to develop in the desegregated schools.

There seems to be three principal reasons why the schools were not reorganized to promote integration. One is that school authorities maintained an assimilationist ideology which encouraged them to adopt "a colorblind perspective" toward integration. The colorblind perspective "sees the purpose of schooling as giving all children a fair chance to learn the skills necessary for success in a basically middle-class society." It does not acknowledge racial differences, and in some schools goes so far as to forbid any reference to race.

Another factor contributing to the lack of emphasis on positive interracial mixing in the schools studied is the primacy of "academics" in the value hierarchy of the school authorities. This led to formal

and informal tracking, and thus resegregated the races, generating antagonism among segregated status groups. The same preference to "academics" also made teachers resistant to non-traditional classroom approaches such as cooperative work groups which they perceived as undermining academic progress for the sake of social goals. At the same time not only did teachers generally see academic standards of their schools as falling because of desegregation; the standards actually fell.

A third reason for the failure of integration is the priority given to order and control. Partly because of community fear of violence which preceded desegregation, the schools felt compelled to overemphasize the need for security and control. Authorities successfully eliminated violence by controlling students' use of space and through rigid time schedule. But this bred defiance. More importantly, it greatly restricted the opportunity for positive interracial mixing among students. It is significant to note, however, that when given the opportunity in terms of space and time, students did not spontaneously develop interracial friendship and cooperation. For example, there was very little interaction across racial lines in the lunchrooms and in the peripheral areas of the school.

Finally, these studies make it clear that teachers are not adequately prepared to foster positive interracial relations in desegregated schools. Teachers had no shared perspectives or strategies toward students. Instead they were distinguished by racial differences in styles of interaction with students, in preference for academic or social goals of schooling, and in their links with the communities from which the children came.

Students' responses also contributed to the lack of integration in several ways. First, although school authorities encouraged equal status and participation in extracurricular activities, these activities nevertheless became arena of resegregation by gender, class and race. For example, blacks tended to dominate such sports as basketball, football, and baseball. Elective offices and school publications became nearly white domains and middle-class. Second, students' response to tracking reinforced resegregation. Black and lower-class students who constituted the majority of those in the lower tracks gave up trying to succeed and simply passed the time. In general, black students gravitated toward "easy course" partly to avoid competing with white students and partly to avoid failing and thereby jeopardize their chances of successfully obtaining the high school diploma required for entering the job market.

Tracking, separate and watered-down curriculum as well as "dim outlook on life associated with poverty," this report tells us, resulted in low self-image among black students in the desegregated schools. And this circumstance led to academic or "mental withdrawal" (c.f. Carter 1970). That is, black students began "either to take the easy way out or simply try to get by in order to get their [diploma] or simply to lose interest altogether in their schoolwork and their studies." This withdrawal from academic interests was accompanied by behavioral problems such as various forms of limiting instructional time, skipping school and classes, as well as by conflict between official rules and peer-group norms about language, dress, and relation to authority. One

result was the disproportionate number of blacks suspended or expelled in the desegregated schools. Differences in cultural background between teachers and students and between white and black students hindered interracial interaction. For example, black and white students differed in levels and types of expressed aggression: white students tended to talk it out whereas black students tended to resort to physical aggression; the two groups also differed in interactional style.

The overall result is that integration as defined in these studies and in interaction theory did not develop in the desegregated schools. The conditions necessary for integration were not met my these schools. In summary, the schools did not recognize cultural and educational pluralism that would have enabled them to reconceptualize the traditional educational practices to promote interracial interaction and cooperation. Furthermore, the school officials made two basic responses detrimental to the development of integration: their taboo on race and their watering down of the curriculum. The result was resegregation in the academic and extracurricular domains. Nor did students desire and develop interracial interaction, cooperation and friendship even when given opportunity to do so. Some desegregation, the monograph concludes, has occurred, but not integration.

Some Further Comments:

Additional Reasons for Failure of Integration: There are two additional reasons for the negative findings of these studies. One is suggested but not emphasized in the summary report and was probably not systematically studied in the field. This is the influence of racial stratification and the stratified groups on race relations within the desegregated schools. These studies failed to recognize racial stratification as a critical independent variable affecting patterns of race relations in the schools. (see Ogbu 1979). Yet in each community whites and blacks are described as stratified into dominant and subordinate groups, differentiated in terms of closure (i.e., membership in the white group was impossible for blacks no matter how educationally, economically, or culturally successful, quite unlike class situation), affiliation of children, and status summation (i.e., the tendency for economic and other socially valued roles and activities to be race-typed), approaching castelike groups (Ogbu 1978a). In other words, black and white children in the desegregated schools came from two stratified and segregated groups in the community in areas of social relations, marriage, affiliation of children, jobs, housing, leisure activities, and education. Before the Brown decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, formal education for each group, particularly in the South, was often different with regard to curriculum and extracurricular activities; and before the civil rights legislations of the 1960s, this differential schooling tended to prepare members of each group for more or less different adult economic, political, and social positions in the wider society. The differential education and preparation for adult life are most fully described in the case of Crossover school in Memphis.

Equal status hypothesis which guided the present studies recognizes, of course, that once in desegregated schools children from the stratified racial groups would not immediately abandon their prior

existing differences to become cooperating friends. But it overestimates the ability of school authorities to influence the children's interracial attitudes and behavior and underestimates the power of parents and other adult members of the racial groups to influence the children to maintain their pre-desegregated attitudes and behavior. Parents do have a tremendous influence on children's beliefs and behavior in general (Clement et al. 1976) and it is reasonable to expect that they would exercise the same influence in regard to desegregation, interracial interaction and friendship networks. Consider that in none of the five communities did white parents send their children voluntarily to the desegregated schools with the expressed goal of giving their children the opportunity for interracial interaction. In Wexler school where white parents voluntarily enrolled their children, the major attractions were the school's superior academic programs and its outstanding physical facilities and equipment, which provided a wide range of valued extracurricular activities. White opposition to potential interracial interaction and friendship among the children is no where more clearly demonstrated than in the prolonged and various forms of resistance to desegregation and in "white flight," whereby white parents either transfer their children from public to private schools or move to the suburbs where there are almost no blacks in the public schools (Clement et al. 1976:3-4; Coleman 1975; 1976; Derian 1972:22; Giles, Cataldo and Gatlin 1976; Hall 1974:5-8; Kirp 1976; Munford 1976; Pettigrew and Green 1976; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1974: 67-68; 1973; Wegmann 1977).

Nor is the influence of the dominant white group limited to their children's beliefs, attitudes, and behavior. It partially accounts for the failure of school authorities to make certain efforts that would have encouraged integration. The schools' emphasis on order and control was in deference to the dominant group's fear of violence. The emphasis on "academics," particularly the institutionalization of formal and informal tracking, was likewise a response to the dominant group's expectations and demands. The relationship between the school authorities and the subordinate black community was also detrimental to the evolution of integrated from desegregated schools. Between the two groups was a pervasive mistrust which is most fully described in the case of Pawnee West. This mistrust undoubtedly influenced in some ways the attitudes and behavior of black students and the response of school authorities toward them.

Negative impacts of racial stratification and of black and white groups on school integration are suggested here and there in the report. But they need to be studied and analyzed more systematically before we will be able to assess the possibility of having integrated schools in racially stratified communities as well as how such integrated schools can be brought about.

The other reason for the negative findings of these studies is that the desegregated schools had not had sufficient time to develop into integrated schools. Except for Crossover school, the studies were carried out immediately following court-ordered desegregation. I have discussed elsewhere the problem of making a valid assessment of social change in desegregated schools within such a short span of time (Ogbu 1979:292), stating that:

> Given the prior coexistence of generations of racial stratification and school segregation and given the continuing stratification of the communities by race, it is difficult to imagine that blacks and whites would immediately cast aside their former attitudes, social habits and boundary symbols when brought together under forced desegregation. It requires time to shed off old attitudes and habits; and it requires time to develop new ones more favorable to interracial social networks. It may be that if these studies were conducted a few years later, their results would have been somewhat different, more positive.

However, had these studies found many interracial interactions, friendship networks, and cooperation as a result of positive efforts of school authorities, it might still not be very accurate to interpret them as evidence of "integration." Such manifestations might be only an outward compliance to what the children perceive as school demands; and their beliefs, attitudes and behavior out of school might be very different. In other words, the children might be exhibiting what urban anthropologists in another context call "situational change" (see Mayer 1962; Mitchell 1966).

Evolution of integrated schools requires more time than adjustment of individual children to what they see as the demands of school situation. A desegregated school can become an integrated school only if after a reasonable period of time, perhaps many years, it acquires a tradition of interracial interaction, friendship, and cooperation. Such a tradition may develop from concerted efforts of school authorities to promote them when the school was first desegregated; they may be later reinforced by events and experiences of subsequent cohorts of black and white students attending the schools. But true integration takes place only when interracial interaction, friendship and cooperation emerge as a part of school tradition, as customary ways of behaving. Whether such schools are characterized by higher academic achievement for among black students is a matter to be investigated. Perhaps such were the schools in the Coleman report (1966) characterized by interracial acceptance and higher test scores among blacks.

Validity of Interaction Theory: One may also question the assumptions of the interaction theory that blacks need to attend integrated schools in order to improve their academic achievement and that such schools provide them with models of success. From a comparative perspective some minority groups have achieved academic success without attending integrated schools, while other minorities have failed to achieve academic success whether or not they attended integrated schools. This is true of minorities both in the United States and other societies (Ogbu 1978).

Interaction theory, like access theory it replaced, fails to account for differences in academic achievement between blacks and whites and among different minorities because neither theory recognizes that schooling (and more particularly the resulting educational credential) is a culturally institutionalized device or strategy for job and status placement and renumeration in contemporary world (Jencks 1972; Ogbu 1978b, 1978c). The amount and quality of schooling offered to a given group by society usually depend on how the society uses and

rewards the group's educational efforts or credentials. Likewise how members of the group respond to their schooling depends on how they perceive such use and rewards for their education, i.e., it depends on what they expect of their formal schooling. Moreover, some subordinate groups like black Americans who, for generations and until recently were denied equal opportunity to compete for improved social and economic status on the basis of schooling, have had to develop alternative or "survival" strategies like clientage (uncle tomming), hustling, collective struggle, and the like for their subsistence and status advancement. The alternative strategies became "institutionalized" in the subordinate community and, like all institutionalized strategies (including schooling) for subsistence and status advancement, they influence people's notion or "theory" of how one succeeds or "makes it," shape people's perception or image of those who succeed in life, influence how people rear their children as well as how the children respond to the way they are treated at home, in the community and at school.

What I am suggesting is that in the case of blacks (particularly ghetto blacks), barriers to educational payoffs have historically caused them not to maximize their school performance. This is not a matter of conscious decisions of individual black children today but a problem of collective realistic and historical adaptation. Blacks have responded to their limited opportunity structure by developing survival strategies whose rules for achievement behavior may be in conflict with those demanded by the schools. But this incongruence between the competencies required for classroom teaching and learning and those required by the survival strategies have not been recognized and placed in proper perspectives by researchers subscribing to either the access theory or the interaction theory. And when the incongruence is recognized it is often misinterpreted. Thus, the present monograph refers to "street-wise" behavior of black children as a part of "cultural pluralism" that must be respected.

But "street-wise" behavior is probably an aspect of hustling as an alternative or survival strategy. As long as the economic realities of black Americans perpetuate hustling as a survival strategy "street-wise" behavior is going to remain obstructive to classroom teaching and learning (see Foster 1974; Silverstein and Krate 1975; Ogbu 1978c, 1979). An important distinction should be recognized between learning problems created by "cultural differences" and those created by "alternative" or "survival strategies." The former can be overcome in a generation or two partly because there may be strong incentives for the culturally different to make conscious and strong efforts to learn in spite of their different cultures. Evidence abounds in the United States of groups with "different cultures" who have succeeded in school just like the white middle class, often without giving up their cultures and becoming assimilated into white middle-class culture. Similarly, there is evidence in "The Third World" of groups with radically different cultures who have successfully learned in Western or European-type schools. Cross-cultural learning appears to be a universal human experience except where it is punctuated by structural barriers, as in the case of certain American minorities. In the case of "alternative" or "survival strategies" there are no such strong incentives as found among those with cultural differences. Often the incentive is for elaboration

of the competencies associated with achievement behavior of the alternative strategies which may be in conflict with those for classroom teaching and learning.

The problems of incongruent competencies for school desegregation and in integration will be adequately addressed only when we make further progress in defining equality of educational opportunity. Recall that before the Coleman report (1966) the conventional view was to equate equal access to school resources with equality of educational opportunity. Following the Coleman report equality of educational opportunity was redefined to mean equal academic achievement (see Coleman 1969:18; Ogbu 1974:206; U.S. Senate Select Committee Report 1972). I have suggested, however, that a very important missing element in the current definition is the equality of opportunity to use one's education and to enjoy the material and other benefits associated with education in the manner defined as appropriate by society. Thus, I would define equality of educational opportunity as equal access to favorable learning conditions for all children coupled with equal opportunity in post-school life for all members of all segments of the society to use their academic skills and educational credentials and to enjoy the rewards of the latter in the manner defined as appropriate by their society. Equal academic achievement is but the result of equality of educational opportunity as defined here. In none of the five communities where the present studies were conducted did local blacks have equal educational opportunity in this sense.

I would suggest that those Americans who have historically experienced equality of educational opportunity as defined here (namely, whites, particularly white middle class) are the ones who have developed competencies congruent with achievement behavior required for school success as well as have developed a tradition of maximizing their school performance. Those Americans who have historically been denied this equality of educational opportunity (namely, blacks and similar caste-like minorities) are the ones who have developed alternative strategies whose competencies are incompatible with achievement behavior required for school success. Others who have not experienced such equality of educational opportunity, or who have not been traditionally denied that equality of educational opportunity, or who have had alternative uses and benefits for their schooling (e.g., some immigrant minorities), are, like the dominant white group, able to maximize their school performance as well as develop competencies and orientations congruent with achievement behavior required for school success, inspite of their cultural differences.

Conclusion:

Social scientists at first used access theory to study school desegregation. The results were inconclusive. In the mid-1960s they formulated a new theory --interaction theory -- to study desegregated schools. The five studies summarized in this monograph deal with one aspect of the interaction theory, namely, the development of integrated from desegregated schools. Such a development did not occur, according to the results of these studies.

However disappointing the findings of the present and previous studies may be, they must not be interpreted to mean that school dese-

gregation is a waste of time and resources and not a desirable goal for two reasons. First, both the access theory and the interaction theory may not be valid explanations of the lower school performance of black children, their low self-image or other aspects of The Promise Of Brown. Second, school desegregation is based on other theories than those of social science and the validity of these theories does not depend on the validity of social science theories or on the proofs of their hypotheses regarding the outcomes of desegregation. In fact, other theories may be in opposition to social science theories. For example, the legal and constitutional theory of school desegregation rejects the interaction theory which posits that desegregation requires a majority of whites at school. Commenting on this point Judge Sobeloff is quoted (Lines 1972:31) as saying that:

> The inventors and proponents of this theory grossly misapprehend the philosophical basis for desegregation. It is not founded upon the concept that white children are a precious resource which should be fairly apportioned. It is not, as Pettigrew suggests, because black children will be improved by their association with their peers. Certainly it is hoped that under integration members of each race will benefit from unfettered contact with their peers. But school segregation is forbidden simply because its perpetuation is a living insult to the black children and immeasurably taints the education they receive. This is the precise lesson of Brown.

School desegregation is thus a desirable goal for legal, constitutional, and ethical reasons. And it is hoped that out of desegregated schools, given a reasonable support and time, will emerge integrated schools as a tradition in American education.

References

Allport, Gordon W.
1954 The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass:Addison-Wesley.

Ashmore, Harry S.
1954 The Negro and The Schools. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press

Bell, Derrick A., Jr.
1972 "Integration: A No Win Policy For Blacks." Inequality In Education, 11:36-44

Bloom, Benjamin S., Allison Davis and Robert D. Hess
1965 Compensatory Education For Cultural Deprivation New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Bryce, Herrington J.
1976 "A Dream Come False." Social Policy, 6:4-6.

Bullock, Henry Allen
1970 A History of Negro Education in The South: From 1619 to The Present New York: Praeger.

Carter, Thomas P.
1970 Mexican American Education: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Cassell, Joan
1978 A Fieldwork Manual for Studying Desegregated Schools. Washington DC: National Institute of Education.

Clark, Kenneth B. and M.P. Clark
1947 "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children." In T.M. Newcomb and E.L. Hartley, eds.: Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt.

Clement, Dorothy C., Margaret Eisenhart, and John W. Wood
1976 "School Desegregation and Educational Inequality: Trends in The Literature 1960-1975." In The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal. Washington DC: The National Institute of Education. Pp. 1-77.

Coleman, James S. et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Coleman, James S.
1969 "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity." In The Editors, Harvard Educational Review: Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. Pp. 9-24.

1975 "Racial Segregation in the Schools: New Research with New Policy Implications." The Phi Delta Kappan, 57:75-78.

Coleman, James S.
1976 "School Desegregation in Large Cities: A Critique of the Coleman "White Flight" Thesis: Response To Professors Pettigrew and Green." Harvard Educational Review, 46:217-224.

Collins, Thomas W. and George W. Noblit
1976 "The Process of Interracial Schooling: An Assessment of Conceptual Framework and Methodological Orientations." In The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal. Washington DC: The National Institute of Education. 79-110.

Derian, Patricia M.
1972 "White Parents' Fears." Inequality of Education, 11:22-23.

Deutsch, Martin
1963 "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process: Some Social and Developmental Considerations." In A.H. Passow, ed.: Education In Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College Press. 163-179.

Editors, Harvard Educational Review
1975 "Busing for Racial Balance." Harvard Educational Review, 45:1-4.

Giles, Michael W., Everett F. Cataldo and Douglas S. Gatlin
1976 "Desegregation and Private Schools." Social Policy, 6:46-48.

Gordon, Edmund W. and Doxey A. Wilkerson
1966 Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged: Programs and Practices: Preschool to College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board

Hall, Leon
1974 "School Desegregation: (A[Hollow]?) Victory." Inequality in Education, 17:5-14.

Kerber, August and Barbara Bommarito
1965 "Preschool Education for the Developing Cortex." In August Kerber and Barbara Bommarito, eds.: The School And The Urban Crisis. New York: Holt: 345-349.

Kirp, David L.
1976 "Race, Politics, and the Courts: School Desegregation in San Francisco." Harvard Educational Review, 46:572-611.

Lines, Patricia M.
1972 "Race and Learning: A Perspective on Research." Inequality in Education, 11:26-34.

Little, Alan and George Smith
1971 Strategies of Compensatory Education: A Review of Educational Projects For The Diad Disadvantaged In The United States. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Mayer, Philip
1962 "Migrancy and the Study of Africans in Towns." American Anthropologist, 64:576-592.

Mitchell, J. Clyde
1966 "Theoretical Orientations in African Urban Studies." In Michael Banton, ed.: The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies. London: Tavistock. 37-68.

Mosteller, Frederick and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds.
1972 "A Pathbreaking Report." In Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, eds.: On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Random House. 3-66.

Munford, Luther
1976 "Desegregation and Private Schools." Social Policy, 6:42-45.

Nevas, Susan R.
1977 "Factors in Desegregation and Integration." Equal Opportunity Review Fall, 1977. 1-4.

Ogbu, John U.
1974 The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood New York: Academic Press
1978a Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-cultural Perspective. New York: Academic Press.
1978b Education, Clientage, and Social Mobility: A Study of Caste and Social Change in the United States and Nigeria. A Paper prepared for Burg Wartenstein Symposium on Social Inequality: Comparative and Developmental Approaches. Vienna, Austria, Aug. 25-Sept. 3, 1978.
1978c Minority School Performance As An Adaptation. Unp. Ms.
1979 "School Desegregation in Racially Stratified Communities--A Problem of Congruence." Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 9:290-292.

Passow, A.H.
1963 Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1969a "Race and Equal Educational Opportunity." In The Editors, Harvard Educational Review, Equality of Educational Opportunity. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. 69-79.
1969b "The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals." In Irwin Katz and Patricia Gurin, eds.: Race and the Social Sciences. New York: Basic Books. 49-112.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Robert L. Green
1976 "School Desegregation in Large Cities: A Critique of the Coleman "White Flight" Thesis. Harvard Educational Review, 46: 1-53.

Rees, Helen E.
1968 Deprivation and Compensatory Education: A Consideration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Reissman, Frank
1962 The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row.

Riffel, Rodney et al.
1976 "Research on Desegregation In School and Classroom Settings: An Annotated Bibliography from a Field Methods Perspective." In The Desegregation Literature: A Critical Appraisal. Washington DC: U.S, The National Institute of Education. 111-160.

St. John, Nancy H.
1975 School Desegregation: Outcomes For Children. New York: Wiley and Sons.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
1967 Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, A Report vol. 1. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1973 School Desegregation in Ten Communities. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1974 Twenty Years After Brown: The Shadow of the Past. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1977 The Unfinished Business: Twenty Years Later, A Report. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Senate, Select Committee
1972 Report: Toward Equal Educational Opportunity. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wax, Murray L., editor
1979 Desegregated Schools: An Intimate Portrait Based On Five Ethnographic Studies. Unp. Ms. Produced for the National Institute of Education.

Wegmann, Robert G.
1977 "White Flight and School Resegregation: Some Hypotheses." Phi Delta Kappan, 58:389-393.

Weinberg, Meyer
1977 Minority Students: A Research Appraisal. Washington DC: The National Institute of Education.

Wilkins, Roger
1972 "Black Parents' Hopes." Inequality in Education, 11:24.

II. Observations of a Middle School Teacher

by

Rachel Melechen

Background

Faced in the 1950s with the problem of deciding where in the metropolitan area to settle our family, we chose Forest City, partially because of the excellent reputation of its schools. The eldest of our three children was about to start school, and we were attracted by a system reputed to be not only the best in the local area, but among the best in the nation. That rating was sustained by a community willing to expend its dollars in support of its schools. By state law, tax levies require a two-thirds majority vote, and the electorate of Forest City had demonstrated, time and again, their consensus for underwriting their schools.

When we settled in Forest City, it was a stable, white, middle-class, residential community of 50,000 people. Attached to a metropolitan area, it was in its own right among the ten largest cities in the state. It was home to peoples of diverse ethnic backgrounds and religious affiliations, and it stimulated intense civic loyalty, so that families who could make such a choice elected to remain there generation after generation. The taxpayers supported not only an elite school system but a variety of other public services, including police and fire departments, and a fine public library.

At that time, there was excellent public transportation linking Forest City to other localities in the metropolitan area. Transportation centered in "the Loop," an area of multi-family residences that thus proved attractive to migrants moving north from rural southern states and to the elderly who chose to remain in the city where they had formerly been home-owners.

The years following World War II brought numerous changes to the area. There was a substantial development of housing, including pleasant apartment houses, but mostly a large number of ranch style houses--typically three bedroom, one and a half bath, with central air-conditioning, built-in appliances, and sundry modern "conveniences." By 1959, the student body was perhaps 90 percent Jewish, and many of the teachers were Jewish. They were housed in about a dozen elementary schools, two junior high schools, and one high school. Over 80 percent of the students considered themselves as college-bound, and the curriculum was largely academic, with many required courses. In competitive examinations, the students scored well above national averages on aptitude, achievement, and intelligence.

Then, in the early 1960s, substantial demographic shifts were triggered when the central city of the urban area declared that its black ghetto was blighted, and large projects were initiated in which thousands of dwellings were razed. The occupants had been lower-class blacks, and their enforced movement initiated a series of waves of migration. They moved into areas which had been stable working-class and middle-class black communities, and these residents now poured into the surrounding county. The City Council of Forest City announced an

"open housing" policy, which welcomed all, regardless of race, and indeed there was a large influx of black families.

Home and apartments became available to blacks when white residents, frightened by their new neighbors, moved even further westward into the county. Black families moved into most sections of Forest City but tended to congregate in the apartments in the "loop" area; into small, old homes in the northeastern sections of the city; and into the new, post-war homes in the western end of the city. A few areas to the west and north of the private university remained predominantly white.

As a result of white emigration from Forest City and black immigration into it, the proportion of black families in the community and black students in the schools has increased from year to year. The number of residents in the city decreased to 45,000 between 1960 and 1970.

At the same time, other changes in the community were taking place which also affected the schools. There were increased numbers of the elderly, who no longer had offspring in school. Some white families with children, continued to live in the city because of its advantages, but sent their children to private schools. These factors, coupled with the declining birth rate, meant that the city was experiencing a loss of students. The decline is still going on, and perhaps accelerating in 1979.

Towards the end of the 1960s it became clear to the school board that the decline in the number of students meant that some of the schools would have to consolidate. By that time two of the elementary schools were totally or predominantly black; one was totally white; and the others had varying ratios of black and white students. Also by this time, the federal government had begun to take an active role in forcing desegregation in some communities throughout the nation. There were many residents in Forest City who believed that it would be best if the city itself began desegregation procedures, rather than having the federal government enforce a version that could be unpalatable to the mass of residents.

With that in mind a group of three candidates to a six-person school board proposed the following: all students would attend kindergarten in their own neighborhoods; all students in grades 1-3 would attend school in the eastern end of the city; and all students enrolled in grades 4-6 would go to schools located in the western part of Forest City. Buses would be provided for students, grades 1-6, living more than a mile from school. Thus, for four out of their first seven school years, students would attend schools in their own neighborhoods. This clustering would allow schools to be closed at both ends of the city, and would in addition provide desegregated schools within the entire district.

The ideas of the three candidates aroused lively interest. The candidates spent several months, attending PTA meetings within various schools, talking to other groups of concerned citizens, etc., and these meetings were usually well attended. The stated objections at these meetings were that it was wrong to break with the tradition of neighborhood schools, and that the cost of busing would be prohibitive. It was clear that if the three candidates were elected they would fight vigorously to put through their plans. The slate lost the election by a landslide vote: 4 to 1.

The problems, however, did not disappear, but intensified as white flight accelerated and school population continued to decrease. The school board was aware, even if the community was not, that some changes would have to be made.

The school board enlisted the help of a group of concerned citizens in coming up with a plan that would result in the closing of some schools, and desegregate the elementary schools. Their work took several years, and the group itself could not reach a consensus. Rather, they turned over to the school board about a dozen different proposals to achieve the stated aims. The board finally accepted the following plan:

All students were to attend their neighborhood schools, Kindergarten through fifth grades. The Junior High school, in the western end of the city would become a Middle School which all sixth and seventh graders would attend. The Junior High near the eastern part of Forest City would accommodate all eighth and ninth graders. The High School would remain unchanged. Plans were made to consolidate the student body of several elementary schools. Buses would be provided, for all students through the seventh grade, who lived more than a mile from school. Under the plan, segregated elementary schools remained intact and are still segregated at present (1979). Since the Junior High and Senior High already served all students living in the city, the plan extended desegregation down to one new grade, the sixth. The announcement that this plan had been accepted was made in April of 1973, to be in effect at the opening of school, in September 1973.

Unlike the Wexler Middle School experience, there was no fear in the community that outbreaks of violence would accompany the creation of the Middle School. On the contrary, there was already an antagonism between the students of the two junior high schools. School officials and the community considered this a problem and hoped that the new arrangements would eliminate the violent confrontations which had intermittently erupted between small bands of students. After the Middle School was opened, this violence disappeared.

Our Middle School was a new concept in the district, and in the metropolitan area as well. Waterford seems to have had several Middle Schools before Wexler was opened. It is probable that some of the difficulties we encountered, which are specific to middle schools, were already known to the administrators at Wexler, and were thereby circumvented or reduced. Also, unlike Wexler, our Middle School held only sixth and seventh grades; our eighth grade was combined with the ninth grade to form the one Junior High School.

By September 1973, when the change was to go into effect, I had been working for two years as a seventh grade social studies teacher in the Junior High nearest the east end of the city. When I had started teaching in 1971, the ratio of white students to black students in my classes was 65 to 35. By September of 1973 that ratio was reversed. What follows here is a result of my own experience and observations as a parent and a teacher; from discussions with and comments by students at the Middle School, and from talks with parents of students in the school (many of whom were my friends). Not only was the Middle School a totally new concept and creation, it was also the <u>only</u> school, under the new plan, in which desegregation was to occur.

In order to accommodate over 1200 students in a building built for about 800 students, an elementary school, directly across the street from the Middle School, became the Middle School Annex. Sixth and seventh grade classes were located in both buildings; the assistant principal had his office in the annex.

The transition to the new school did not go smoothly. In another community in the county where a similar transition was underway for similar reasons, the Superintendent, the School Board, and administrators spent a year meeting with parents of children who would be affected by the change. The meetings were low-key; held in residents' homes, at parents' convenience--weekdays, weekends, evenings. Groups were small; each parent had the opportunity to air concerns and anxieties, and to give suggestions. Where distrust remained after a meeting, others were scheduled until parents felt reassured. It would be foolish to believe that these meetings were the only reason the transition in that school district seems to have been accomplished without much strain, but no doubt the meetings helped.

In Forest City there was no such preparation. During the months between April and September of 1973, as far as I know, no attempt was made to meet with students or parents, to work out any foreseeable difficulties. Parents were unhappy; students were unhappy; and so was the staff.

Some parents objected to the plan because it was new and a break with tradition. Some didn't understand the concept of the Middle School, or the reason for one. Many parents objected to the busing of their children. Some objected because their children had to walk many blocks to the nearest bus stop; even more complaints were heard from parents about early, late and missed school buses. The most vociferous complaints were about the behavior on the buses. In addition, parents were upset that because of the two buildings, their children had to be out of doors in inclement weather as they walked from one building to another. There was concern that a child might be hurt by a passing automobile. There was agitation to build a tunnel between the two buildings; to station a crossing guard between the schools during school hours; to install an electric signal. Although the use of the annex provided enough classroom space, the halls in the main building were very crowded and noisy during class changes and parents complained about the jostling and pushing that occurred during that time. White parents complained that their children were being harassed and intimidated by black students. They complained and complained and complained.

Students were also unhappy. Some were upset because their parents were upset. Some disliked riding the buses. Especially in the first few weeks many students were bewildered by the vastness of the schools; they were accustomed to the small, intimate atmosphere of their elementary schools which had housed no more than 300 students. This larger school with its 1200 students seemed chaotic and threatening. They often lost their way around the buildings and were unsettled and afraid. Some students felt insulted to be in a school with sixth graders. They had been looking forward to entering the more grown-up setting of a Junior High, sharing the same experiences as the older and more knowledgeable eighth and ninth graders. And, for those students coming from all black or all white schools, the transition was particularly diffi-

cult. They lacked the experience with, and knowledge of the patterns of behavior of the "other" racial group. They were ill-at-ease, suspicious, hostile. They were insecure in the presence of those with whom they had never before interacted. Racial antagonism was real, almost palpable. Outbursts, both verbal and physical were common. Hostility was expressed by students not only to children of the "other" race, but to teachers of the "other" race as well.

Many teachers at the Middle School were unhappy. Although some teachers had volunteered to teach in the Middle School, many were assigned by their former principals and few of these welcomed the opportunity. There was some awareness on the part of the administration that teachers might find the change difficult, and so special meetings were held with the entire staff for several days prior to the opening of school. We had a chance to interact slightly with each other; to sense the style of the administration; even to elect a faculty council. But the meetings did little to dispel the negative feelings of many of the staff. Teachers, like parents and students, didn't welcome the change.

For several years prior to the creation of the middle school, seventh grade teachers in both Junior High Schools had adopted a team approach to teaching. The purpose was to help students, coming from elementary schools, to adjust to the larger, more impersonal secondary school by providing a "home base" for a group of students. Teams were headed by four teachers--of math, science, language arts and social studies--assigned to a set of from 130-165 students. Throughout the day, the students rotated among the four team teachers, taking some classes (music, art, gym, foreign language) with specialty teachers who were not part of any team. The four team teachers had simultaneous planning periods to enable them to share with each other common concerns about students, to meet together with parents, to plan interdisciplinary approaches, to plan field trips, etc.

It was decided to retain this team approach in the seventh grade at the Middle School; and some sixth grade teachers also decided to team. Before our first meeting as a group, we were asked to indicate the teachers with whom we would like to work in the coming academic year. Where teachers were not placed with those they had chosen, teachers became even more disgruntled. (In some cases, the joining of four teachers who had previously been unknown to each other worked well; in some cases, it was disastrous.)

There was one difficulty encountered in our Middle School which did not seem to arise in Wexler, and which added to the general dissatisfaction--a philosophical difference between sixth and seventh grade teachers.

Sixth grade teachers usually spend all (or most) of the day with the same students. Teaching all (or most) subjects to this group of students on a daily basis, they tend to teach "the child". There is less of an emphasis on subject matter, as such. Teachers have more time in which to get to know each student, and to individualize instruction for each child. There is the possibility of close interaction among child, parent and teacher. Seventh grade teachers, on the other hand, who meet 130 or more students each day, are by interest and training, more likely to think primarily in terms of specific areas of knowledge. There is a generalized tendency to expect students to be capable of

dealing with the required content. There is less time and opportunity to get to know 130 students than is available to the sixth grade teacher. This difference in orientation and the numbers of students one meets with each day, leads to different attitudes towards such matters as the use of the report card in evaluating students; parent-teacher conferences; home contacts; expectations that teachers have of students; scheduling, etc. Although accommodations have been made on both sides, there is still a lingering dissatisfaction with the Middle School, particularly on the part of sixth grade teachers.

And last, but very important, was the added problem of racial antagonism or suspiciousness among some members of the faculty. Some teachers, both black and white, were prone to feel that any disagreement, however trivial, was racially motivated.

Adding to our difficulties was our principal, an affectionate, accepting, non-judgmental human being who loved students and was loved by them. He was very supportive of his staff, and allowed his teachers a great deal of freedom to do as they wished. However, he was thoroughly ineffective and inept as an administrator. He never could get his paper work out of the way; parents and students were notified of important events long after the particular situation had passed; he frequently misplaced or lost (or never completed) work considered important by teachers, e.g. teacher evaluations, and he exercised almost no leadership. His method of running the school was to do very little...he just relaxed and loved everyone--even those who were against him. He made many teachers feel lost, insecure, undirected, and consequently, miserable. Thus, the first year of the Middle School was one where parents were dissatisfied and worried, students were fearful and angry, and low morale infected teachers.

Currently, the Middle School is running quite smoothly, and the above conditions no longer exist. Our first principal was replaced after his first year by a man proficient in administrative matters. His appointment was greeted with a great sense of relief. During our first year in the Middle School he had been the assistant principal, and as such, was sensitive to the problems of staff, students and parents. Some of the faculty knew him when he was an assistant principal in charge of the seventh grade at one of the Junior High schools. There he was accessible, concerned about the problems of the seventh grade staff, and took pains to remedy problems. He also spent a certain amount of time working with specific students who had special problems of one sort or another.

He seemed committed to consulting with teachers about many situations: scheduling, curriculum development, etc. He encouraged teachers to participate in a local Middle School association. The faculty council was very active, and he gave it a great deal of responsibility; he sought its advice, and often followed it.

However, in his new role as principal, he changed and managed to plunge much of the faculty into a state of low morale. Perhaps his responsibilities as principal were more than he had anticipated. Whatever the reason, he lost touch with his faculty; the skills he had once demonstrated in relating to people were no longer in evidence.

He was perceived by students as dour, which made them feel the loss of the first principal as particularly painful. He did not smile or

greet students or teachers when he encountered them in the hall or lunchrooms or classrooms. If teachers had problems, he would listen, and promise relief, but the help would not arrive. He lost the respect of all but a few of the staff, and managed to antagonize many. Example: New teacher evaluation forms were developed by the Superintendent's office. Essentially it was a check list of about 35 characteristics, and the form replaced one in which principals had evaluated teachers in several broad categories. Most teachers preferred the former form, and in all schools that I know about, so did the principal. The teacher uproar that ensued as a result of his evaluations was so great that he agreed to re-write them. Example: Teachers called a special faculty meeting and asked the principals to attend. The purpose of the meeting was to let the administrators know that we felt the school was divided into two camps: the administrators against the faculty. We rarely received praise, but we were quick to be criticized. We were asking for positive feedback; for recognition of our efforts; we wanted to be appreciated. The assistant principal acknowledged his own deficiency and promised to make amends. The principal said nothing in response to our request. He did not change.

He even managed to offend the community. In his second year, he was informed that the school would be assigned four less teachers in the next school year because of a drop in enrollment. Contrary to his usual democratic methods, he did not consult with the faculty about where the cuts would be made, but decided that the equivalent of one seventh grade team would be dismissed. Unfortunately, two of the cuts were of extremely popular teachers. Parents objected so strenuously that the board offered them contracts anyway, thereby overruling the principal's decision.

Nor did he show the leadership we had expected of him. When we learned that there would be one less seventh grade team the next year, we also realized that we would be teaching over 160 students each day. When we complained, he said there was nothing he could do. Teachers took matters into their hands; they called a special faculty meeting and asked the Superintendent to be present, for it was he who had decided our school was to lose four teachers. The superintendent said he could do nothing for the coming year, but that if we would agree to write one paragraph explaining the team structure and outlining our complaints, he would take it to the School Board during the next academic year, together with some other proposals he had for other schools, and perhaps we would get more teachers two years later. Dutifully, we tried to write, in one paragraph, what he had asked for, and after a long struggle, found it impossible to do. He had warned us that the paragraph must be brief; he would not submit anything of greater length. It was only when our principal saw our failure, that he then made a suggestion which brought some relief.

By the end of his second year, teacher dissatisfaction was known to the School Board, and by the end of his third year, he resigned.

Our current (third) principal is a woman who has some of the best qualities of the first two incumbents. She is fair and firm, and the students recognize that and respect her. She is always available for consultation with students, staff and parents. She listens well, and generally her responses are humane and reasonable. She is a fine admin-

istrator; has a good sense of humor; is open with praise, and doesn't spare judiciously given criticism. She is not without her faults, but her defects have not caused teacher morale to drop.

Instead, for a number of reasons: a scheduling change, a commitment on the part of the administration to take care of discipline problems, and her ability as an administrator, the mood in the school is good. There are the expectable complaints from students, teachers, and parents, but there is no longer the sense that the faculty and administration are divided into the warring camps, which was the legacy of her predecessor. Teacher talk, these days, is not filled with anger towards the administration, but is mostly concerned with educational problems: how to motivate students; how to increase student skills; etc. The change is a good one.

Integration, Desegregation and Tracking

We do not have an integrated Middle School. Nor am I certain that the term "desegregated" can be applied to a school which is so predominantly of one race. In this past academic year, less than 15 percent of the students served by our team were white.

In the cafeteria, at recess, in buses--in any situation where the students were free to choose their own companions--segregation was the norm. There were a few exceptions; they were rare. Interracial friendships occasionally existed among boys who shared a common sports activity. Among a few girls, who have attended elementary school together, there are friendships which have grown through the years, prior to their coming to the Middle School. But even such contact is usually limited to school hours.

Up until this year, an effort was made to have each class, where possible, reflect the black-white ratio of the team. Starting with the next academic year, other criteria have been set that will probably serve to further segregate students.

In the past, "exceptional" students were assigned to special classes outside the team. For example, students who had very low mathematics skills received special instruction in small classes in a recently equipped math lab. Students who showed a special apptitude for math were also removed from the team to attend an on-going, specially designed math program, which continues into the Junior High and High School. Students who needed remedial work in reading were scheduled into very small reading groups, off the team. Students gifted in language arts were enrolled in special "challenge" classes outside the team.

During the coming year, the students who need help in reading will still be sent for this help, outside the team. But all students will take language arts on the team. They will be scheduled into these classes according to their ability; those students who formerly had left the team for "challenge" classes will be challenged within the team. This probably means that there will be both black and white students present in the most able grouping, but at the lowest level, classes are likely to be all black.

Another thrust towards re-segregation is the decision, which makes sense from the teacher's point-of-view: to remove the math teacher from the team. Each math teacher will instruct students who have reached a certain skill and not have to, any longer, try to deal with 25 students

in a class who might be on as many as six different levels. This decision is also likely to see the low-skilled classes with predominantly black students, and the higher ability classes with both black and white students.*

The thrust for this type of scheduling is understandable. Some students indeed may progress more in this setting than in a heterogeneous one. But the implications for getting to know and accept and enjoy people of the "other" race are disastrous.

There is no stated policy of tracking in the school district. In the seventh grade, although each team will receive a cross-section of students across ability and racial lines, within the team, starting the next school year, tracking will occur. From the eighth through the twelfth grades there is self-tracking. Students are allowed to choose their own courses. When, in the recent past, the State Board of Education lowered the number of required courses in academic subjects that students had to pass in order to graduate, Forest City also lowered its requirements. Thus, it is possible, at the present time, for a student to graduate from the High School with just one year of language arts, one of social studies, and one of math. (Toward the end of this past academic year (1978-79) there seems to be a groundswell of pressure for reinstating more stringent graduation requirements.) Under the present circumstances it is possible for students to graduate having taken a majority of "easy" courses Students thus "track" themselves. To make the selection even easier the High School has initiated a plan in which courses in the same subject matter--American History, for example--are numbered, so that students know that a 100 course requires less work than a 200 course, which is less demanding than a 300 course. To a large extent, these practices were put into effect to respond to the very real differences among our students in terms of achievement and skills; and because of the fear of further white flight if white parents felt their children were not being stimulated.

Together with the thrust towards tracking, teachers seem to be demanding less of students each year. Unhappily, I see that in myself. Eight years ago, I required students to write four research papers, based on two or more sources, which were to be at least ten pages in length. During the last eight years, I have lowered my demands so that up to a few years ago, a research paper was just one of many kinds of work a student could hand in; in the last two years, I haven't even asked for them. I do demand that my students prove to me that they really know the material they are supposed to have learned. I avoid test questions which allow students to simply recognize correct answers (true or false, multiple choice). But I also avoid, because so many students would fail, questions which require students to compare and contrast certain information or concepts, or which ask them to analyze or evaluate material. Even so, there has been a certain amount of flak

---

*That white students are the best students is not accurate. In the attempt to avoid adding to a stereotype, I should note that of the nine students on our team who were recommended to repeat seventh grade next year because they failed three or more academic courses, two were white.

from parents about my hard tests; I've even been accused this year of "ripping off" the students by asking too much of them, and of teaching subject matter that properly belongs in high school or college.

Courses have been "watered down" in yet another way. There has been a greater use of visual aids in the classroom to teach material and concepts. Printed material is chosen which, while directed at seventh graders, is written on the fourth or fifth or sixth grade level. Even our foreign language classes, which are offered only to students who have no reading problems and do well in language arts, have changed, so that at least half the course is spent in learning about the culture and history of Spain or Russia or France or ancient Rome, and only half the time on the language proper.

Another thrust towards diluting courses comes from the state government. In the past few years, there has been increasing pressure upon the state legislature to create competency tests for all students in the state. The State Board of Education has intervened, suggesting instead that they formulate the tests, and the concerned legislators have agreed, for the present, to give them this right.

The State Board of Education has formulated tests in three areas: math, language arts, and government and economics. They are to be taken by eighth graders; they consist of 39 multiple choice questions each, covering various basic concepts.

In a voluntary pilot study, in the spring of 1978, the students in our district scored poorly in all three tests in comparison with other school districts who also volunteered to take the test; our scores were among the lowest in the county.

In the spring of 1979, the tests were mandatory. There was an improvement in the scores of our students. Although not all school districts have announced their results, in comparison with those results which have been published, our eighth graders again did poorly.

To avoid the embarrassment of such a poor showing, the Middle School, next year, will pretest all sixth and seventh grade students, based on a prototype of the exam, created within our district. Testing will be continued throughout the school year. The specific deficiencies of each student will then be analyzed, and special work given to that student to help bring up his or her scores. It is clear, that in placing such emphasis on the results of a test, that Forest City wants to improve its public image. It also seems likely, that in order to bring up test scores, that a large amount of time will be spent in grades 6, 7, and 8 in reviewing the kinds of information asked for on the test. With this specific emphasis there is a real possibility that instead of the test as an instrument of discovering minimum competency, teaching "the test" will become the predominant content, or perhaps the only content, in many classrooms.

School Board and Superintendent

In our school district and in other districts known to me, the responsibilities of the School Board are quite different from those mentioned in the report. Our Board is made up of six people, elected by residents to this non-paying post. The School Board handles financial matters; sets the budget; negotiates with teachers about salaries and salary schedules. It discusses other matters, with teachers as well: the

yearly calendar, fringe benefits, etc. General directions for running the school are formulated by the Board; they are put into more concrete terms by the Superintendent and her staff.* The Board also evaluates the performance of the Superintendent; and it serves as the court of appeals for the staff in grievance procedures against administrators. However, the Board is not concerned with any day-to-day activities of running the school.

The Superintendent allocates money among schools; she decides how many teaching positions each school will receive. She appoints school principals and assistant administrators. She appoints heads of various departments: curriculum, personnel, etc. She evaluates principals and other administrators.

The day-to-day running of the school is in the hands of the principals. They decide such matters as the number of periods in a day; how to use teachers and aides allocated to the school; how money, given to the school for supplies and texts, will be divided among the various departments; and they are ultimately responsible for maintenance, for the buses, for discipline,--for everything that goes on in the school. With teacher advice, our principal decides the kinds of foods that will be available in the cafeteria; the retention policy for students failing academically; use of in-service days, etc. Teachers have full discretion for running their classrooms; for purchasing materials; for assigning grades.

There is no doubt in my mind that the single most important factor in running a school is the competence of its principal.

Several years ago the Board instituted a policy where each one of the six members would become responsible for one or more of the schools in the district. Each Board member then becomes a link between the school and the School Board, or Superintendent, or the Community. In one instance, this unique structure was very beneficial to our school. In the previously described situation (page 13) in which our teachers were unhappy at the prospect of teaching a much greater number of students in the coming year, and the Superintendent was of no help, our principal finally suggested it might be helpful to contact the Board member assigned to our school. We had a series of meetings, exploring the various budgetary possibilities with her, and as a result of her endeavors, we regained two of the four teaching positions we had been scheduled to lose.

Racial Prejudice

In our school district as a whole, there has been only sporadic and generally unsuccessful attempts to deal with racial antagonism and distrust among and between students and teachers. In the High School, several years ago, an assistant principal invited half-a-dozen teachers each week to meet with him to explore this problem. Very few people showed up. Voluntary workshops were offered to teachers in the district

*For the last two years our Superintendent has been a woman. She was formerly the principal of a middle school located in the East.

to explore the problem of how to resolve conflicts; but they were not specifically directed toward racial conflict. Another voluntary workshop dealt with the current (and historical) black perspective; it was extremely illuminating--very well done--but we were a passive, listening audience. It still did not help us come to terms with our own difficulties and blind spots.

The Middle School, because it needs buses to take students to and from school, cannot incorporate after-school activities as a possible method to foster integration, unless students are willing to walk home after school, or parents are willing to pick up students when activities are over. Occasionally, students do arrange to stay after school if they are to perform in an evening program (gymnastics, chorus, band), and they manage to find ways of getting home. But no clubs meet after school; we don't even have a student council.

One year, in order to help our students integrate, we arranged the students' schedules so as to incorporate one club period a week during the school day. Teachers were asked to sponsor clubs; students were asked to choose three clubs, with the understanding they would be palced in one of the three. However, without the use of a computer, the scheduling, which was done by the faculty council after school, took more than a month. Because so many students signed up for athletic events, and the gym facilities were limited, many students were angry that they did <u>not</u> get one of their three choices, and were placed in activities for which few students had signed. Many students skipped the club period, and wandered the halls. Teachers were pulled out of club assignments to patrol the halls. There was enough overt dissatisfaction that the club period was eventually dropped. Although the idea was a good one, and might have served to foster integration, it certainly did not do so. Perhaps the compulsory aspect of it was a built-in handicap. The project failed, and it has never been revived.

The atmosphere in the Middle School has decidedly improved since it opened six years ago, even if integration has not occurred. Suspiciousness and fear are not prevalent. There seems to be an absence of racial hostility. When fights occur, they are not racially motivated. Intimidation occurs--but race is not a factor.. just the strong picking on the weak.

It is unlikely that racial prejudice has disappeared, but there is almost no verbal expression of it. It would take an unusual event to provoke it. Perhaps since blacks predominate overwhelmingly in the Middle School, they feel secure in that setting,* and are not threatened by the few white students in their classes. Most of the white students come from families which tolerate or actually encourage bi-racial experiences, and so are not likely to feel racial aggression.

---

*It is estimated that the number of black people in our county is close to 20%. My black students, this year, on the basis of their own observations are convinced and <u>certain</u> that the figure is fallacious, and that blacks are the majority not only in our city, but in the county as well.

Desegregation: A Summary

The impact of the presence of many black students in our schools, and the removal of white students, has been profound. In contrast to our former standing as a school whose performance on standardized tests was excellent, our students now perform well below the national norm. Teachers don't need the test scores to discover that students read poorly and are deficient in common computational skills. In 1972, even before the Middle School opened, the School Board decided to stop administering intelligence tests. Black parents protested that such tests were unfair to black students.

One response, from the office of the Superintendent, to the low achievement scores of our students, is to some extent to lessen teacher control of the classroom. Forest City has had a history of allowing each teacher to teach the subject matter most comfortable to him or her, as long as the appropriate skills were developed. The thrust is now in the other direction, and we are being locked into teaching, at each grade level, a prescribed content. The Superintendent seems to be acting on the premise that the low achievement of many of our students is a direct result of teachers not emphasizing the "right" subjects.

It is certainly obvious from the report and from my own experiences that schools which have desegregated may undergo a process of re-segregation. It has happened in our Junior High and High Schools and is likely to occur in the Middle School. It is also true that a desegregated school does not provide for integration unless the staff is ready and willing to help its students (and themselves) to understand the "other" race. Which brings to mind the following observations:

From year to year, more and more responsibilities have been placed upon the schools, and teachers. Within the last decade, in addition to teaching the expected material and skills to our students, we have been asked to discourage our students from the use of drugs, including tobacco; to teach that sexuality, if it occurs in early adolescence, should be undertaken with a sense of responsibility to oneself and one's partner; to work with moral reasoning and help our students move from one level of moral development to the next; to help our students become aware of the wide range of job possibilities and how their own interests and talents might be put to use in a variety of careers; and to reduce or eliminate prejudice and foster integration.

All of these are worthwhile goals. They're all important. They should be taught. I am not sure, however, that the school is the best, or even a good setting for teaching all of these. Drug abuse, moral underdevelopment, racial prejudice are such pervasive problems that it is unrealistic to expect the schools to solve them. What is particularly worrisome is that we are asked to do more and more in the schools, and seem to be increasingly ineffective in everything we are trying to accomplish.

Happily, without our active intervention, there are some positive signs. For example, seven and eights years ago when I was teaching at the Junior High School, there was an enormous amount of pressure among black girls to discourage any one of them from becoming attached to and forming a friendship with a white girl. Today, such pressure is absent. Indeed, in some classroom situations, which students perceive to be

against the authority of the teachers (cheating on tests, copying each other's homework) there is as much help offered between the races as within each race. While working together on specific projects in the classroom, differences in race seem to play no part.

It seems that spending time together, year after year, engaged in common activities in the same classroom as the "other" race, has allowed students to get to know and accept each other. In a very small way, then, desegregated schools can foster acceptance, even though contact between the races is minimal. What will happen when schools become re-segregated? We'll eventually find out.

III. Less Than Meets The Eye

by

Margaret D. LeCompte

The Wax summary of five ethnographic studies of desegregated schools promised a great deal but does not deliver as much as it promises. Both Practitioners and Academics reading such a document will be looking for answers - though of a different kind. Teachers, administrators, and politicians will be looking for guidelines and techniques that they can utilize toward the immediate solution of a pressing problem; Academics will be hopeful of an explanation of the complex phenomena under examination, or at least, a conceptual framework, consistently applied, which might explain variation in the pehnomena. Neither are provided, although some useful insights can be teased out of the material presented. While it is difficult to quarrel with the well-stated initial premise--that ethnography is a particularly useful tool for studying processes such as those involved in desegregation of schools, and is a technique which provides insights garnered by no other means--the brevity of the report has obviated the richness of data and explanatory detail which is a hallmark of good ethnography and permits its conclusions to be well grounded. What remains are some rather trite and atheoretical explanations for the failure of schools really to desegregate--such as absence of effective leadership from the principals--and an idiosyncratic view of the whole process of desegregation which ignores some of the more important structural aspects of the conflict inherent in such a situation. In short, the article under review earns plaudits for what it attempts to do and some serious criticisms for what it fails to do.

It is first necessary to begin with a brief description of what Wax was attempting to do so that an examination of the paper may assess it in its own terms, and then to discuss its virtues and shortcomings.

The paper sets out to do four things. First, it attempts to present findings common to all five experiments in desegregation. In this way, Wax hoped to achieve a second objective--to de-emphasize the faults, as well as the virtues, of any particular school site. Third, he wished to indicate which problems were common to all five schools. Fourth, he hoped to overcome what has hitherto been regarded as a serious limitation on the use of ethnography. He hope to achieve, through the aggregated handling of ethnographic data, what has in the past been achieved only in surveys or in the comparative use of many case studies, collected over time and often using dissimilar data-gathering techniques. By utilizing case studies which were made at the same point in time, and which alleged to use the same foci and research techniques, a degree of generalizability was sought, as well as a final document which, in its brevity and breadth, might be more palatable than reams and reams of an ethnographic monograph.

Wax wished to focus on the individual context of desegregation, and asks the question, What characteristics of the desegregated setting relate to changes in student attitudes and behaviors toward Blacks? In

so doing, he attempts to examine the development of interracial interaction. Implicit is the assumption that attitudinal change cannot take place if people are isolated from one another, and also implicit is the belief that one cannot ask questions about the intensity of individual feelings and attitudes toward a situation until one knows what the actual content of those feelings and attitudes might be. These are the limitations of past research that the monographs attempt to overcome--a preoccupation with measurement of outcomes without first having defined the process and content of the process which defined the outcomes in the first place.

Throughout the document it appears that the researchers were concerned with exploring the validity or impact of some "myths" or commonly held beliefs about the effects of desegregation. One is led to feel that they felt impelled to disprove that evil effects naturally emanated from a desegregated school, and found it distressing to report that in most cases the commonly held beliefs, for a variety of reasons, had good reason for existing.

These beliefs included the following:

1. Desegregation ultimately leads to an increase in violence in the school.

What is particularly fascinating about the accounts contained in this document is that while violence did, in fact, appear to increase, it seemed to derive more from the stringent attempts of school personnel to avoid it than from the children themselves, and when it did occur, often was treated more strictly than if the schools had not been under such stress. It appears that the expectancy of violence in some cases virtually led to conditions which caused it. In addition, the document clearly illustrates mere bureaucratic bungling was not alone in heightening awareness of what might be called aggressive behavior; much of what might be called violence simply derived from cultural differences in interaction patterns, which were misunderstood by blacks and whites alike.

2. Desegregation problems derive from poor leadership in the schools.

While this factor may, indeed aggravate an already difficult situation, it tends to trivialize the complexity of the situation, and is not, in fact, well documented in the monographs.

3. Contact with people from different races alone will lead to racial harmony without any special structuring of or help with the contact.

The monograph clearly documents the existence of this belief among the teachers studied. Its genesis seems to be found in a legacy of de-politicization in teacher training long cherished in the United States, one which seems to value the non-controversial, even naivete, among teachers.

4. School quality will decline as a consequence of desegregation.

5. The curriculum will be altered as a consequence of desegregation, especially insofar as whites move away from the desegregated situation.

Four and Five are related, and appear to be a function of community belief structure rather than exclusively attributable to changes in the quality of educational program, or changes in the socioeconomic or racial characteristics of the children. The monographs do, however, point out that what is often attributed to the mere fact that increasing numbers of non-white children attend a particular school may, in fact, be more a consequence of crowding of the school, cut-backs in funding and program, and changes in the beliefs teachers held about children. A desegregated school seems to acquire a "spoiled identity" which casts doubt upon its "quality," whether that identity derives from the characteristics of the students, the subjective belief structure of community and teachers, or from deliberate actions on the part of school officials to dilute the quality of education. The notion of spoiled identity is not, however, addressed specifically in the monograph.

Having presented what appear to be the primary concerns of the author and the concerns which seemed to guide the ethnographies upon which this document is based, let us now examine both the form and content of the document. My comments include the following: First, a discussion of the methods used for developing the original monographs and the form of the summary article. Second, with respect to the content of the summary document, discussion will center upon the concept of cultural linkages between the school and the community; the impact of school organization and leadership style upon desegregating schools; the nature of cultural differences in desegregating schools; the concept of "spoiled identity" and the subjective context of the school, and some comments upon the utility of manipulating the relationship between the schools and the social structure to achieve a more equitable society.

Methods and Form

Wax presents a very convincing case for the use of ethnographic techniques in social research, especially when the questions addressed involve problems of interaction, process, and in settings or situations for which no well-grounded descriptions exist from which to generate hypotheses. Much of the indadequacy of research in education, in particular, derives from its predilection for using research techniques inappropriate to the state of the art. It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of innovations, for example, when no base line data prior to innovations have been collected; equally difficult to find out how children feel about classrooms when we do not even know what really goes on in classrooms. Much of this stems from an attempt by educators, and social scientists in general, to make their work appear more truly scientific, but the effect has been to turn out much research which has not been grounded in data, much less in theory. With regard to the present studies on desegregation, they are a refreshing change from the dominant mode for assessing schooling outcomes. In these, desired

outcomes are specified in advance and then tested for in surveys and scales of various types, in a pre-test-post-test design without even going into the institution under examination to ask whether the outcomes asked for or the questions posed make any sense under the circumstances. I well remember administering a classroom climate instrument to a group of boys in a predominantly black inner city high school. The research team had had to translate and simplify the instrument to meet the low reading levels of the students involved, but even so, the instrument had to be read aloud to the fifty students who were taking it. Many of them simply marked all the answers on the right side of the answer sheet. Evaluators were overjoyed to find that so many students really liked their school. Those of us who administered the instrument wondered how many of the stuents had understood the questions, or if they did, whether they took it seriously. Many had simply answered randomly. More to the point, we thought, was the question we were asked by one thoughtful student as we left. "Why are you so concerned with what goes on in the classroom? We can't even get to school without being shot at!" We had no instrument for measuring gunfire, so it did not enter into the report transmitted to the Office of Education.

Thus, ethnography provides the basis for formulating meaningful questions about the process or phenomenon being studied, which, in the case of desegregating schools, is a complex one indeed, trivialized by other modes of research through over simplification. Especially in the case of these monographs, which proposed to elicit the viewpoints of significant actors in the situation, ethnography is crucial, and must precede quantitative assessment through surveys. This is because surveys and other forms of more "objective" tests assume that the researcher has knowledge of the argot and attitudes of the participants, whereas in the desegregated school studies, these are exactly the bits of knowledge most needed.

There have been many calls--mostly from anthropologists--for an increasingly active anthropology of education. The real problem, it seems to me, is to find an anthropology IN education; such that strangers cease to study schools and make monographs of the fascinating tribes therein, and rather, the tools and skills of the anthropologist become somehow transmuted into teacher training programs and put to their use. Until this happens, it is reasonable to expect continuing tomes of ungrounded educational research, given the experimental and positivitic model which dominates most contemporary educational thinking.

Form

For all of its sensitivity and value as a research tool ethnography suffers from a fatal disease--lack of conciseness. Points have to be proven through the recounting of many instances of behavior observed, stories told, interactions recorded. The anthropologist does not have neat and elegant tables to report in a 500 word precis of a three year study. Because they are just too long, policy makers rarely read the insightful documents of anthropologists. If they do, they are often dismissed as case study reports of idiosyncratic phenomena.

Wax has made a serious and saluatory attempt to make ethnography palatable to those who should be reading it -- educators and policy-

makers -- by condensing the findings from five ethnographies into one report. But it is too short. It doesn't provide enough illustrative richness to support its conclusions convincingly. One of the values of ethnography is its often, if well done, photographic richness of detail; perhaps in trying hard to generalize and to condense, this summary has divested the original studies of their vigor. It also makes less credible the conclusions Wax makes as to the reasons for the failure of desegregation to work.

Perhaps the problem lies in trying to convince oneself that an orange is actually an apple. Wide sampling from a large population is valuable, and so is the case study. But to make one into the other does neither justice. In trying to concentrate upon the similarities in the five situations, the summary document hides the idiosyncratic nature and complexity of the phenomena under study; while they are all variations on the same theme, homogenization does them no justice. An attempt to compare on both similarities and differences would have been more enlightening, especially in the form of a typology of the problems which are unique to and common to, a number of desegregations attempts. One might even determine, under such an analysis, situations in which desegregation attempts would be totally doomed, rather than simply bemoan their lack of total success. It might also have been possible to follow systematically the conceptual frames mentioned at the beginning of the article, but then discarded.

One can only imagine the pressure from politicians on researchers such as the ones who executed the five studies, pressures which led to the form of this document. Responding to them is necessary, but it may be that homogenization is not the most efficient way in which to do so. It bastardizes the method without increasing the utility of the findings, and may simply serve to increase the bias against qualitative research in education.

School Leadership and Organization

Part of the summary document focuses on causes of failure internal to the school establishment itself. So doing reinforces the belief, common among educators, that the solution to social problems lie in some magical manipulation of the clients, structure, or employees of the school, rather than in some major rearrangement of social structure relationships within the society.

The conclusions reached in the summary--that it is "the principal who established the milieu for desegregation and thus the interracial experience of students" is not even really substantiated by the data presented. This may, in fact, be an artifact of the brevity of the report. However, one could as easily say that in the communities studied, beliefs about proper behavior in the school changed and that it was the belief structure regarding etiquette and interraction in interracial settings which was causal, not the leadership within the school. Principals, in fact, simply became pawns of situations which they often could not control. It appears that power plays, interracial strife, and pressures from teachers, parents, business, and elsewhere arise regardless of the administrative styles of educational leaders. There may, in fact, be no one style of leadership which is appropriate, especially since even the highly touted trait of "flexibility" can, in some situa-

tions, be defined as wishy-washiness. Using research of this nature to prove the need for more effective leadership in schools is very much like using research on conflict resolution to substantiate recommendations for creating more love in the world; it does neither the method nor the findings any favors, especially since it is difficult to define "effective leadership" as it is to define love. Especially in the cross-cultural setting, what works in one situation may not work in another.

While it is undeniably true that principals play a substantial role in determining the school climate at a given point in time, it is disquieting to assign to such an idiosyncratic variable as principal personality or style the major responsibility for success or failure of a desegregation program. Elizabeth Eddy's excellent work on a desegregated school attempt indicates just how much this is true (Eddy, 1976); despite intended and careful advance planning within the school, events outside it conspired to scuttle the program. Thus, more deeply rooted structural factors and societal sources of conflict must bear responsibility for much of the failure of experiments in desegregation. While less comforting to politicians, such a formulation may be of greater help to practitioners on the firing line; even the greatest of creativity and talent on the part of principals may not be able to make a success of desegregation in the schools.

One must also consider the nature of the authority structure of schools. Principals are a good deal like city politicians in a weak mayor form of government. Much of their power lies not in their formal relationships, but in the personal clout they can amass. Structurally, schools are "loosely coupled" (Firestone, 1977); that is, the linkages between teachers and principals are not direct, and it is very difficult for principals to monitor the daily activities of all teachers in every classroom. The nature of the teaching enterprise and the very structure of school buildings is such that in most cases, what is of most import to daily life of students, and most intimate, goes on behind the closed door of the classroom (Lortie, 1969). Thus, even with the best of intentions, the diffuse nature of the authority structure within the school may make strong leadership contrary to the wishes of the teaching staff impossible.

Principals may also be pawns in charge of implementing innovations which were never intended to work in the first place. It is fascinating in the studies reported that in almost every case, the size of the school and the consequent crowding--increased as desegregation proceeded. One would not wish to suggest that desegregated schools become "behavioral sinks," but it is also clear that stress mounts incrementally as the numbers of potential problems (children) increase. It would be interesting to determine if the level of funding for maintenance, program, and supplies suffered a consequent decrease, as it has in many schools which undergo racial transformation in clientele. One becomes curious whether the problems in the school can actually be attributed to the conditions internal to the school (racial composition) or can rather be a function of a confounding set of conditions which increasingly deprived and stressed the inmates of the school.

Size itself represents an interesting variable. Personal relationships require a degree of intimacy to flourish; intimacy does not

flourish easily in mass institutions. As size increases, the chance for personal relationship of any kind must of necessity, fall victim to the need for people management of the type found in large urban schools where children march in lines and move quickly from classroom to classroom, facilitating most efficient use of the building. Under stress, even those activities which might foster intimacy disapper--lunchtime, recess, clubs, and sports. What remains is a schooling factory. While little research has been done on the size of schools as a function of the school experience, early work does suggest that school size is inversely related to participation in extracurricular activities (Barker and Gump, 1960). It appears that we are asking the least prepared members of our society--children--to engage in the most delicate and painful of negotiations-between races--under conditions which almost surely predict failure for the majority. It is our largest schools--those in the cities--which are to be desegregated, and when desegregated, these become larger. Not only does largeness mitigate against personalized treatment of difficult social problems, but it also increases the number and diversity of groups wishing to have a voice in the operations of the schools. This can lead to an impasse, as the New York City school demonstrated for so long (Rogers, 1969) where pluralism was manipulated to powerlessness.

Teacher Socialization

A major contribution of the summary is its isolation of the "color blind" phenomenon. Color blindness as a social policy is a convenient fiction for avoiding unpleasant realities; its rationale is: "Racism is taboo; o.k., so, we won't see color!" While such a policy is undoubtedly well-intended, its idiocy is illustrated in recent practice which forbade recording the racial group of students enrolled in districts--thus preventing any assessment of the degree of integration within those districts. Color blindness goes further, though, in that discussion of anything related to color or race becomes interdicted as well. Avoidance of the controversial is such as conscious practice that one needs to look for its origins beyond the case at hand.

The history of teacher training is replete with what might be called Horace Mann's legacy; he dictated, and practiced in his own career the expunging of anything which might be considered partisan in his behavior, in school and out, as long as he was a schoolman. (Curti, 1959). He also insisted that teachers in Massachusetts follow the same practice. Generations of teachers since then have been imbued with the dogma that sex, politics, religion, race, and anything with blood and guts in it--unless centuries old--be avoided. Perhaps this is why the teaching of history has been so dull for so long-at least until one reaches college and begins to study what really happened. Recruitment patterns of teachers also indicate that the profession tends to draw in those who cherish law and order and avoid controversy; thus we institutionalize gutless teaching and laissez-faire problem solving, further exacerbating the social wilderness into which children in desegregated schools are thrown.

Cultural Differences

Perhaps the strongest contribution of this document is that it clearly illustrated the futility and danger of adopting a colorblind ideology in the face of major cultural differences. The monographs document the subtleties of disjuncture in cultural attitudes toward time, space, and aggression which strongly affect the school milieu, and the patterns of interaction of such concern in this study. They also document clearly how misunderstanding of cultural cues increased interracial tension.

Sheridan school probably was the most successful of the desegregated schools because it existed in a milieu which already had legitimized cultural contact for many generations. In New York City, where children have to meet different types of people every day outside the schools, interracial contacts may be facilitated. People have some repertory of behavior for interacting with people from different cultural groups. In many places where desegregation was put into effect, people had never touched, seen, talked with, or been friends with people from other races. Where the school is the only desegregated institution in an otherwise segregated world, a situation analogous to Harry Golden's "vertical integration" exists: the crossracial experience becomes encapsulated from the rest of life experience, and affects it very little. Where integrated "turfs" outside the school can exist, interracial modes of coping may develop, particularly where there is more than one minority, and in situations where the milieu promises more opportunity to ethnically different groups than is the case in many cities where Blacks have had little access to higher status.

The monographs point out that the majority of the students who were desegregated had had little experience in crossing color, culture, and economic lines; school did not do much to help them develop shared experiences. Only middle class children from both races seemed to have mutually intelligible codes for communicating, even though somewhat at their individual peril; perhaps being middle class provided them with a conceptual framework which we might call tolerance to be able to interact with each other (see Bernstein, 1977). The majority of the students could not explore among themselves or with helpful teachers the meaning of patterns or, for example, physical interaction which were considered normal by Blacks but threatening and hostile to whites. The result was fear of discrimination and violence on both sides. It appears that this fear is not limited to any one group; whichever is in the minority fears that the majority favors their "own kind." The problem is exacerbated, however, when a majority in a school comes from a minority within the culture, and that minority is of less social status than the majority.

While it is true that many of the differences among children which teachers find objectionable are actually social class differences--poorer dress, nutrition, dialect--there are clear cultural differences not only in racial groups, but among the age groups (adults and students) within the school. Teachers were different from children, but at least the white children could understand the culture of adult teachers as resembling that of their parents. Thus the tragedy of the school dance, wherein Black students danced to the Black band; teachers and white students danced to the White band, and amidst the cacaphony which must have existed, a gaping no-man's land yawned in the gymnasium separating the two, symbolically as well as actually.

Spoiled Identity and the Subjective Context of the School

Early in the summary Wax discusses Allport's contact thesis as a possible conceptual framework for the paper. This states that reduction of stereotyping will not occur unless equal status for each group or individual in contact is supported. This theme, though introduced at the beginning of the summer, is not carried through; were it to have been applied systematically to all five case studies it might have provided an accurate, if gloomy, explanation for some of the problems that ensued in the schools.

Some of the schools did in fact try to establish practices designed to promote status parity, even though the issue was a difficult one because the question of status was confounded by race. Middle class Blacks encountered greater obstacles to success than whites in striving for high academic and social status. Even when initial attempts were made to improve or to preserve not just the quality of curriculum, but social status parity among groups, they usually were not maintained for more than a year. Thus no test of Allport's thesis could be made.

The question then becomes: Why is it so nearly impossible to develop and maintain status parity? Does Nature abhor equality? The answers seems to lie in the values which are assigned to certain kinds of associations and the extent to which other associations are viewed as dangerous or contaminating. Of particular importance are those associations which threatened a cherished identity or access to an identity which is desired.

In the United States, association with Blacks is valued by few whites; in most cultures whiteness is valued more highly than darkness, notwithstanding recent success in movements to view "Black" as beautiful. White or light skin has been accorded more value and status, and association with whiteness is sought after. This is because association with higher status people tends to lend a halo of higher status, and thus to be sought after, while association with people of lower status also rubs off, but in a way which may be contaminating.

There is, too, the question of numbers. Policy makers do not worry very much if there are few Blacks in a given situation, but concern increases exponentially if whites are scarce. The isolated Black or Mexican-American child is of less concern than the isolated white child; the furor generated may in fact be a measure of the degree to which white society values one group over another, and views association with some critical mass (subjectively defined) of Blacks as dangerous because it threatens to spoil the identification which whites have with a dominant position in society.

The concept works reciprocally; middle class Blacks elected to Student Council are ostracized from the Black peer groups for trying to "be like Whitey" just as cross-racial friendships may create a spoiled identity for Blacks and Whites of both high and low status, who are seen as traitors to their racial and social class peers.

Institutions and communities may acquire spoiled identities as well, especially when harmful associations involve the perceptions of future life chances for children or the integrity of a community. When a white school becomes racially mixed, the perception of its quality is threatened; its identity "blackens." But the problem does not exist

only for white schools. Almost any desegregation situation involves loss by all sides. Where the school to be desegregated already exists, whichever community, Black or White, which dominated the school before loses it. "Ownership" of a school may serve as a source of community pride and stability; turning what was heretofore a center for community life and identity into a racially mixed school may destroy a key focus of community identity and power. Indeed, removal of a school may be viewed by Blacks as a deliberate attempt on the part of a white Establishment to dilute Black political clout, rather than an effort to improve education.

Where schools are constructed especially to facilitate desegregation, determination of the actual location may turn into a power struggle over ownership between white and Black communities, in part because the question of control over the school really involves the larger question, at least in this society, of control over the future life chances of one's children.

It is a firmly held belief in western societies that children who do not receive "good" schooling do not succeed. Parents who are unable to influence schools their children attend feel that they have little influence over the future occupational and social status of their children. Herein lies the deeper problem of the subjective context in which schools operate.

More important than actual facilities offered in school are the beliefs which teachers, parents, administrators and students have about them. Parents will send children to private schools which appear in every way inferior to the nearby public school because they believe that the education provided in private schools is better, insofar as they are more congruent with a parental way of life and expectations for their children. Parents, politicians, and teachers believe that when non-white children become numerous in a school the quality declines, and they act in such a way as to insure that it does. A few non-whites can be tolerated, but beyond the subjective quantity of "a few," non-whites become a threat to the identity and quality of the school. Whites withdraw their children, teachers water down course offerings, principals impose draconian measures to insure law and order in the school, not so much because of real differences, but because of strongly held beliefs about the disparity betwee whites and non-whites. Not only the curriculum, but the social climate of the school suffers, further discouraging cross-racial contact. Some disparities do exist, both at the cultural and socioeconomic levels, but the intensity with which participants in desegregation enact their expectancies into a self-fulfilling prophecy, often in the absence of objective evidence, indicates the difficulty ever of achieving a true test of Allport's thesis. Even when the objective status of people is equal, as is often the case in integrating neighborhoods, the fact of integration "spoils" the context, causing people to act, in fear, as if they were not.

Cultural Linkages Between School and Community

The Wax article points out the problems inherent in the desegregated school, but though it describes the community, it fails to demonstrate the linkages between internal school problems and community social and

power structure. It does not provide any suggestions as to the means by which structural problems--societal, or cultural--may be addressed. While the strict cultural reproduction argument as advanced by many researchers (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Bourdieu 1977; Lundgren, 1979) may be a bit too deterministic, it is fairly clear that the problems of these schools were generated at least in part outside the schools.

The summary tries to illustrate the embedding of the school in its cultural context and to demonstrate how the dynamics of the school could not really be understood absent the neighborhood and historical context, but it doesn't make the linkages as explicit as in another article. This first examined the careful planning for desegregation which took place in a school, almost convincing the reader that failure was impossible...until the community context was examined, which demonstrated clearly that the power of the community had not decreed success and parity of esteem for the effort. Failure of the innovation from this perspective was inevitable (Eddy, 1976).

The schools have for centuries served to reinforce and to legitimate social status relationships within society. More than simply segregating children physically from each other, they have served to present curricula which differed significantly by social class and ethnicity, and which articulated with different segments of the occupational social ladder (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). Further, it is entirely possible that the schools systematically reinforce the home culture of some children (and therefore are more effective in their socialization) more than for others, thus serving to facilitate differentiation by social and economic status, albeit indirectly (Bernstein, 1977).

When groups are desegregated by race, they re-segregate by social class. Unfortunately, the realities of our society mean that re-segregation leaves the majority of Black children at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder. The question is, How can equal status be accorded to groups with unequal achievement in a heavily achievement dominated society? Both scholarly research and folk wisdom have supported belief that how much one achieves academically predicts future occupational achievement. Thus, losers in school become losers on the outside, and society has structured its credentialling procedures to reinforce that set of beliefs.

Another set of linkages, not to the degree of equality and tolerance within the society, but with the job market, affects the aspirations of students in desegregated schools. Low levels of achievement lead to low levels of status and vice versa; the process is in fact assisted by instituting practices of counseling and testing. However, the fact that Black students in Memphis and elsewhere seek an education only so that they can get a job is a realistic appraisal of the job market and of their life chances, given many generations of job discrimination. Why hope to go to college to become an engineer when the only jobs open to Black engineers have been in the Post Office? While teachers may deplore the lack of a student culture supportive of and congruent with teacher values, and view with alarm skipping school, not doing homework, and not viewing school as an intellectual challenge, these attitudes may be wholly congruent with the reality outside the classroom. It is, however, a vicious circle that reinforces the cycle of spoiled identity; teachers no longer think that their students are

bright and motivated, and further water down and impoverish the curriculum.

Cultural Transformation, Desegregation, and Schooling

Wax begins the article by echoing George Counts, suggesting that we may dare to build a new social and racial order through desegregating the schools. It is difficult not to find this a seductive idea, especially given the propensity for Americans, since colonial times, to attempt social reformation through manipulation of the educational system. For generations, education has been a convenient band-aid to be applied to all social ulcers. That our ulcers still exist is an indication that the band-aid may not be totally effective, or that it simply does not articulate closely enough to the core of the problem to achieve quick or lasting results.

There never has been an egalitarian society, and perhaps there never will be. This is not to suggest that strong efforts should not be made to increase the levels of equity within society, and it is clear, from comparison with other societies, that the United States has made major strides in many areas in the direction of egalitarianism. The intransigence of problems described in the Wax article simply demonstrates how far we have to go in changing race and social class relations, as well as the futility of continuing to try to solve all social problems by sending children to school.

We can get an idea of what happens in a desegregating school by looking at the five monographs summarized in the Wax article, but we cannot determine from them a cure to the problems of racial segregation and inequality. This is especially so since desegregation policies seem to confuse the issue of integration with the issue of equality. Integrated education may be more egalitarian than segregated education, depending upon the variables by which children are segregated. Mixing low income children of both races in inferior schools, which is what desegregation often means in the inner city, provides them only with equal opportunities to be poorly educated, and may even destroy the fabric of the communities from whence they come. Thus, the problems need to be disaggregated; desegregation does not necessarily produce equality, and equality of opportunity in no way produces equality of outcomes, especially in education. We may desegregate school, which is a worthy goal. But we can at best expect from that only improved race relations, not social and economic equality.

Another issue which needs to be addressed is the somewhat romantic rhetoric with which desegregation plans often are cloaked. While it would be salutory if one could just mix children and teachers racially and then leave them alone to develop healthful social relationships, to expect that to happen is romantic indeed. To expect it to happen when those in charge of implementation are decidedly unromantic, decidedly pragmatic, and short-sighted educators and politicians, is folly, although leadership alone is not the crucial issue. Much more intransigent forces may doom attempts to achieve integration, as Pettigrew defines it, by means of desegregation. The extent of the failure of desegregation programs--by which I mean the inevitable process of impoverishment in schools following conventional attempts at desegre-

gation--is the measure of the strength of efforts by the middle class establishment to perpetuate its culture, reproducing the existing social class and power arrangements of society.

Bibliography

Barker, Roger G. & Gump, Paul V.
1964 Big School, Small School. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Bernstein, G.
1975 "Class and Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible." In Studies in The Learning Sciences." Paris: O.E.C.D.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1977 "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." In Karabel, Jerome & Halsey, A. H., Power and Ideology in Education. New York: Oxford University Press

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H.
1976 Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books

Curti, Merle
197[illegible] The Social Ideas of American Educators. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Company

Eddy, Elizabeth M.
1976 "Educational International Desegregation: A Case Study of Symbolic Realignment." In Roberts, Joan I. and Akinsaya, Sh[illegible]rie K., Schooling in the Cultural Context, New York: David McKay Company, pp. 157-168.

Firestone, William A.
1977 "Control Issues Attending the Management of Student Learning." Unpublished manuscript prepared for Research For Better Schools, Inc. Philadelphia PA, October

Lortie, Dan C.
"The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." In The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. Editor, Amitai Etzioni. New York: The Free Press.

Lundgren, Ulf P. & Petterson, Sten
1979 Code, Context, and Curriculum Processes: Studies in Curriculum Theory and Cultural Reproduction/3. Stockholm Institute of Education: Department of Educational Research

Rogers, David
1968 110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York City Schools. New York: Random House